



University
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

SYNOPSIS

1. Introduction

The aim and the nature of the work stated. The present day crisis of the individual. The need for the existential decision for God. The failure of the "conceptualist" theological thinking to offer adequate categories for the formulation of the theology to a man in existential crisis. The search for the personalistic thinking, in theology, which is also the quest for the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

PART I.

2. The New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

(a) The teaching of the Synoptics concerning the problem Jesus and the Holy Spirit. The understanding of the person of Jesus The Christ. The unique possession of the Holy Spirit by Jesus. This reveals that his human existence veils within itself the Incarnate Word of God, with whom the Father through the Holy Spirit reveals the one-ness of Being. This is not the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit in Jesus, but the revelation of the Word in Jesus by the Holy Spirit, who also reveals Jesus to Himself as the Christ.

(b) The teaching of the IVth Evangelist concerning the Comforter. The Johannine contribution towards the understanding of the relationship of Jesus the Christ and the Holy Spirit. This in turn reveals the nature and character of God which implicitly destroys the Jewish Unitarian conception of Him.

(c) The teaching of the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles and the other New Testament writings concerning the Holy Spirit. The Revelation of the Holy Spirit as the present Reality in the Church according to the Promise of Christ. The revelation of Christ through and in the Holy Spirit as the Lord (Kyrios) who is and who is still to come. (The words Maranatha spoken in the Church reveal that Christ is present in the Holy Spirit in the Church. Other aspects of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit expounded.

The/

ProQuest Number: 10662723

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10662723

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

The data of the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit present themselves as the quest for the understanding of the Christian Doctrine of God and serve as the Prolegomena of this Doctrine.

PART II.

The Christian Doctrine of God.

Chapter One.

The problem stated. The Birth of Christianity inside Judaism. The parting of the ways between Jewish Unitarianism and Christian Trinitarianism. Two different conceptions of Monotheism.

(a) The development of the Christian Doctrine of God from the New Testament period onwards until the IVth century. Tertullian and Origen. St. Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers.

(b) A re-statement of the Christian Doctrine of God in terms of Analogia amoris.

Chapter Two.

The justification of the Christian Doctrine of God on the basis of the structure of personality. Personality, Divine and Human.

Chapter Three.

The Doctrine of Filioque. A conceptualistic theological thinking engenders this Doctrine while a personalistic (existential) theological thinking denies the Doctrine of Filioque.

PART III.

Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed teaching concerning the Holy Spirit.

- (a) The Concept of Sobornost in E. Orthodoxy.
- (b) The Concept of the Juridical Mission of Christ in Roman Catholicism.
- (c) The concept of the Scripture as the sole norm of the Church, its faith and life in the Reformer Church.

APPENDIX A.

The old Testament ideas concerning the Spirit of God. The problem stated in relation to the Creation, moral order and history which is the stage of God's action in the world.

APPENDIX B.

Some theological, historical sketches of the German theology in connection with the problems raised in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
EASTERN ORTHODOX, ROMAN CATHOLIC
AND REFORMED TEACHING.

by

B. ASHANIN, B.D.

A PRAYER TO THE HOLY SPIRIT.

"O Heavenly King the Comforter,
Spirit of Truth, Who art in all
Places and fillest all things;
Treasury of Blessings and Bountiful
Giver of Life: come and dwell amongst us,
And cleanse us from every stain
And save our souls Gracious Lord".

Amen.

(From Preparatory Service of
the Holy Liturgy in the
Eastern Orthodox Church).

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

This thesis is an attempt to explore the significance of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Christian revelation. I first became conscious of the supreme importance of this doctrine for the resolution of those problems of human existence which were raised by the philosophy of existentialism.

I lived before and during the war in Europe and after it became an exile. From these experiences I realised the reality and relevance of the problems raised by existentialism. Yet I could not accept the metaphysical pre-supposition of many existential philosophers. The resolution of man's 'existential dread' seemed to me forever insoluble without the suffering love of God which meets man in his existential dread. I managed to preserve the identity of my being, or what philosophers call 'self-relatedness' only by an inner awareness that the cross of man's agony is also that of God's. Jesus, the Christ, Son of the Living God had been crucified. God had accepted the cross and had conquered its dread by taking it into Himself. In this way the quest for anthropology brought me to see its unity with theology.

Theologically/

Theologically I was unable to grasp the mystery of this unity without an understanding of the Church. So the quest for the meaning of human destiny brought me to the realisation of the Tri-unity of anthropology, theology and ecclesiology. Their indestructible unity made me aware of a common principle central to all three.

But how do we define this principle? The most obvious way was to approach the problem christologically. (Christ the God-man must be the key to the understanding of their inter-relatedness). I soon discovered that an approach to the problem of Christian revelation from a purely christological standpoint lacked existential depth and degenerated into mere scholasticism. I noticed that Christology is not self contained. Its existential nature is hidden elsewhere and theology based upon it showed only Unity of Anthropology, Theology and Ecclesiology, as a necessity of Christian thought, and not as existential correlation. Their unity depended on a theologian's creative act of thought rather than being a discovery of his creative spirit. Thus 'pure Christology' was not helpful to me. In this impasse I saw that Christology must be kept but its nature must be understood more meaningfully and existentially. I became aware that the quest for this Christology was a quest for the Doctrine of/

of the Holy Spirit.

The inter-relation of Christology and Pneumatology is implied in the personalistic understanding of the Christian revelation, i.e. its existential relevance for human destiny. I decided to approach the problem of the unity of anthropology, theology, and ecclesiology from the standpoint of the unity of Christology and Pneumatology, that is, the unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. This brought me to the possibility of explaining the ambiguities in human existence - being and non-being; freedom and slavery; being and becoming: of the problems of the Church, its divisions, its inability to understand the relationship between its historicity and its transcendent nature. It became obvious to me that only the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit could explain the existential character of the Christian revelation for it embodied in itself the "trinity" of man, God and the Church. I realised that the revelation is only intelligible when approached from the unity of these three.

Thus it has been necessary to write this work on a very wide range of biblical and theological enquiry. Here an attempt has been made to present theology "existentially". To me, Christian theology in a unique and most/

most personalistic way answers the problems which existentialist philosophy is posing. Out of my 'existential situation' I was aware that, in spite of the dread in human existence, my being constantly sought for a theodicy, the acknowledgment of God as the meaning of human existence and the Being Who overcomes the non-being in human existence. This inner demand for theodicy brought me to see the mystery of being in terms of the Christian revelation. The existential nature of the Christian revelation is grasped most meaningfully through the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In the Holy Spirit is, I realised, hidden the theodicy, which I sought to formulate.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been falsified by the individualistic understanding of the Christian revelation - namely:- God's revelation of Himself to man from His transcendence directly, asking Him to take seriously only his own being without any relationship to and responsibility for the world in which he lives. Here the personal guidance of the Holy Spirit is claimed. This ego-centric interpretation of the Holy Spirit is alien to the Christian revelation, especially when the claim of the Holy Spirit's guidance is used to impose one's own authority upon others in order to subjugate them. Secondly, this doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been exploited/

exploited and used for clothing the Church as an institution with a body of laws and dogmas, which are to a great extent purely a human creation, with the authority of the Holy Spirit. In this instance, I am thinking especially of the Canon Law in the Roman Catholic Church, the theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas and in Protestant Orthodoxy, "Protestant Doctrines (e.g. Predestination) and Confessions of Faith. Here we witness history conditioning the Holy Spirit rather than being inspired by Him.

As a reaction from the two ways in which the Holy Spirit is being 'objectivised' (in the words of Nicolas Berdyaev "turned into an It") instead of being experienced as the Living Thou of God and His Christ, we have the third apostasy - namely, the complete disappearance of the Holy Spirit from Christian theology.

In order to save theology from dehumanising and depersonalising thought, the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit must be brought back to its proper place. This thesis is an attempt to stimulate discussion on the problem.

* * * * *

THE PLAN OF THE WORK.

1. It has been necessary to examine Biblical sources of both Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament teaching is the background against which the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit must be examined, and for that reason it has been inserted at the very end as an appendix.
2. The quest for the understanding of the nature of Christian Revelation is a quest for the understanding of the nature of God. The Second Part of this work is an attempt to formulate and to show the existential relevance of the Doctrine of God for the being and destiny of man.
3. The Third Part contains some aspects of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the theology of the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches.

This thesis is an attempt to portray objectively the theology of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, justifying no particular school of Theology or Church, giving a critical appraisal of many theological views examined during the course of study.

As I am an Eastern Orthodox Christian I am aware that
it/

it may be thought that I have a theological bias; but any 'Eastern Orthodox' view that I may have expressed is due to one reason only - that in the Eastern Orthodox theology there was expressed as nowhere else, the existential understanding of the Christian faith. And this fact has naturally influenced me as this is the case with other theologians in similar situations. If this existential understanding of the Christian Revelation in the 'Tri-unity' of Anthropology, Theology and Ecclesiology had been expressed more personalistically and more meaningfully elsewhere I would be eager to adjust my 'Eastern Orthodox' views. This I think must be the attitude of all who are engaged in the study of theology in the University. In this lies the particular service of such theologians, contributing to the oecumenicity of the Church, the Body of Christ, in which the Holy Spirit dwells.

* * * * *

C O N T E N T S.

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Introduction	1 - 7
 <u>PART ONE.</u>	
<u>NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.</u>	
Introduction	1 - 4
1. The Synoptic Gospels	5 - 38
2. The Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel	38 - 70
3. Studies in The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Acts, The Pauline Epistles, and other New Testament writings . . .	76 - 161.
 <u>PART TWO.</u>	
<u>CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD.</u>	
1. (a) God as The Trinity	1 - 40
(b) A Restatement of the Christian Doctrine of God	41 - 62
2. The Personality of God	63 - 97
Appendix I.	
Appendix II.	
Appendix III.	
Appendix IV.	114
3. The Doctrine of Filioque	115 - 147
 <u>PART THREE.</u>	
<u>THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX, ROMAN CATHOLIC AND REFORMED THEOLOGY.</u>	
Introduction	1 - 4
1. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Eastern Orthodox Theology	5 - 54.
2. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Roman Catholic Theology	55 - 98.
3. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Reformed Theology	99 - 150.

CONTENTS.

2.

Page No.

APPENDIX A.

OLD TESTAMENT IDEAS CONCERNING THE
SPIRIT OF GOD.

I Part	...	1 - 4
II Part	...	1 - 6
III Part	...	1 - 16

APPENDIX B.

THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLF BUITEMANN WITHIN
THE SETTING OF GERMAN THEOLOGY I - XV.

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION:

The revelation of God in Christ of which the New Testament is the record, refuses to yield its full meaning unless there is an understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which I consider an essential doctrine of the New Testament.

It is only through an adequate conception of what is meant in the New Testament by the Holy Spirit that the great realities of which the New Testament speaks - God, Christ, the Church, the Salvation of Man, victory over evil and death and the final establishment of the Kingdom of God - appear as existential, the be or not to be of man's existence, and not as mere problematical ideas. This is what they meant to the writers of the New Testament, and to the primitive Church (German - die Urgemeinde). If their meaning is not of such acute importance to the Christian believer of today, the reason is simply this, that he has lost the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which needs to be recovered urgently. The urgency of the need cannot be overstressed.

This doctrine presents many difficulties for the student of New Testament theology who wishes to present it/

it meaningfully and systematically although it underlies and is implicit in the whole of the New Testament. This is why so many writings on this subject are unsatisfactory. They start by making the greatest of claims for this doctrine and finish by leaving the reader with the impression that this doctrine is after all a side issue.

The Holy Spirit confronts us with the New Testament Revelation as the Divine claim upon us in Christ and yet at the same time remains hidden behind the realities of which He makes us aware to such an extent that He escapes our fuller knowledge of Him. It is only after we have struggled with the realities of the New Testament in order to relate them to each other and make their meaning more intelligible, and after we have recognised their significance for us, that we feel, spiritually, religiously and theologically, that they refuse to be fully grasped until we have acquired a more complete understanding of the Holy Spirit, who is their inner meaning and the inner meaning of our being when grasped by the New Testament Revelation. Thus, the quest for the Holy Spirit is the quest for the meaning of the New Testament Revelation to us.

The New Testament is pneumatocentric, but this pneumatocentricity/

pneumatocentricity points, not directly to itself, but to Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, as the Divine disclosure of God in human existence. Thus the pneumatocentricity of the New Testament becomes Christocentricity. This makes the Christological problem a pneumatological problem and vice-versa. Pneumatology is the possibility of Christology and Christology is the meaning of Pneumatology. Because of this, in the New Testament God is not spoken of in abstract terms as is the case with religious philosophy, but is spoken of as revealed in Christ since this is the only way in which God speaks of Himself, for in Christ He is fully revealed. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses this point trenchantly:

"In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, (Note the stress on the finality of time), whom he appointed the heir of all things, (again the note of finality), through whom also he created the world. He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature, (again the note of finality), upholding the universe by his word of power". (Hebrews 1, 1-3).

We propose, therefore, to study the Pneumatology of the New Testament as a Christological problem. By doing so, we hope to show that Christology and Pneumatology are mutually inter-dependent. Later, when the New Testament pneumatology has been fully discussed, the full/

full implication of this method for the Christian Doctrine of God will be demonstrated.

As New Testament literature the problem will be studied in three sections:

1. The Synoptic Gospels.
2. The Fourth Gospel.
3. Acts, Pauline Epistles and other New Testament writings.

Theologically, however, this study presents the following problems for study, which broadly correspond to the above divisions:

1. Jesus and the Holy Spirit.
2. The Holy Spirit as the promise of Jesus, the Christ, made to the Church, of the Comforter in His stead.
3. The Holy Spirit and the Church.

These divisions are of necessity schematic and somewhat arbitrary, although they are useful as a method provided it is constantly borne in mind that all the aspects of the problem are inter-related and have full meaning only in relation to the problem as a whole. Although the studies are sub-divided into sections as above, they overlap one on the other, and in consequence there will be occasional cross-references from one section to another in the course of the studies in this chapter.

1. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

The central theme of the Synoptic Gospels is the Divine disclosure of God in Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, and the uniqueness and finality of this Revelation. This idea is woven into the whole structure of the synoptic tradition, the central motif of which is presented in the questions Jesus asked of his disciples at Caesarea Philippi - (Mark 8.28 ff; cf. Mt. 16.3 ff.; Lk. 9.18 ff.):

a) Whom do men say that I am?

and, in a more direct and relevant counterpart to the first question,

b) Whom do you say that I am?

Here the problem is postulated in two ways. First it is the speculative probability of human thought in general and as such, at first, it appears hypothetical and lacking in existential significance. Secondly, in the question directed at the disciples, the generality of the first question is turned into the particularity of personal demand for decision (German: die Entscheidung) which demands faith and makes the problem of the Revelation of God in Christ the inner concern of every individual existence./

existence. This faith is not something which man can afford to treat as he likes, but a necessity of human existence. Thus faith presents itself as a unique and final element in existence to which it gives meaning. It points to man existentially that his destiny lies in his acceptance of Jesus as the Christ and in belonging to the fellowship of those who profess faith in Jesus as the Christ. The answer Peter gave, "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God", is acknowledged by Jesus, according to Matthew 16.16, "Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven". These two questions, one with its generality and speculative probability, and the other with its individual and concrete address and response of faith in which the deepest selfhood of man is involved, depict the whole problem of man and his faith most tellingly. Man starts being not an individual but man in general, an abstraction. Thus, God is to him also as he himself is, an idea and a probability. Faith singles him out, makes him into an individual, a concrete being, but this only happens when God ceases to be a probability and becomes a concrete reality to him. He recognises God in Christ whom he acknowledges as the Son of/

of the Living God.

The Synoptic tradition presents this confession of faith in Jesus as the Christ made by the disciples as significant for all men. That is why the question to the disciples is prefaced by the question about men in general and their opinion of Jesus. This confession is the summit of an experience which is described as Divine Revelation in which God reveals His own concreteness (in the confession of Jesus as the Christ), and the individuality of man is asserted. In the Matthew version of this incident at Caesarea Philippi, when Peter had addressed his confession, "You are the Christ", the reply "You are Peter" was spoken as if he were never Peter before, and indeed in the deepest sense of the reality which this faith discovers, this was just so.

The Synoptic Gospels present us with the authentication of the faith that Jesus is the Christ, by describing certain instances from the life of Jesus, which, through divine self-authentication, demonstrate that here was no imposter, but indeed God with men. The whole of the Gospel tradition is unanimous in asserting that this was strikingly obvious from the beginning of Jesus' ministry. At the very beginning of His ministry stands His baptism, in which God testifies to/

to Jesus as His Beloved Son and Jesus knows Himself to be so. (Mk. 1.11; cf. Mt. 3.13 ff; Lu. 3.21,22; Jn. 1.29 ff.) At his baptism Jesus receives the Holy Spirit and in this story we meet the pneumatological problem as the inner meaning of Christology. For here, the problem of the Person of Jesus is encountered as the problem of the Holy Spirit and it continues to be so throughout the New Testament.

The Gospel tradition places great emphasis on the story of the Baptism, for it sees in it the answer to the question, who Jesus of Nazareth was. In this event, the Holy Spirit is described as the authentication of Jesus' Divine Sonship. The descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus in Baptism, the voice from heaven and the Person of Jesus witness to each other so that there should be no doubt that here God was revealing Himself, and that the meaning of this Revelation had to be grasped in terms of the Person of Jesus and of the Holy Spirit who, in the Baptism, descended upon Him. Here not only is the Divine Sonship of Jesus disclosed, but also, in the testimony to Jesus as the Beloved Son, the Holy Spirit is revealed as God's own Divine self, uniquely given to the Son, and/

and through whose power the Divine Sonship of Jesus will be manifested and testified to in his human existence.^{1.}

1. It is not surprising that many New Testament scholars put such stress upon the significance of the Baptism for Christological studies in the New Testament. Professor O. Cullmann, in his lectures on "Christology of the New Testament", delivered in Basle University in Summer Semester, 1954, spoke of Jesus' experience of the Baptism as what determined the nature of Messiahship for him, for through this experience He comprehended His Divine Sonship revealed in the Baptism in terms of the Suffering Servant. To this experience Jesus remained faithful, 'obedient unto death, even death on the cross' as Philipians 2.8 puts it.

F. Büchsel, (op.cit.p.161) says: "Jesu Geistbesitz beginnt in der Taufe. Die Taufgeschichte erzählt, wie Jesu den Geist empfängt, und wie zugleich eine Himmelstimme an ihn oder über ihn ertönt. Die Sinn der Himmelstimme ist, die Geistverleihung zu deuten. Gott gibt ihm den Geist und sagt ihm zugleich was er ihm mit der Gabe seines Geistes verleiht; das Wort Gottes an Jesus erklärt die Tat Gottes an Jesus. Also, die Taufgeschichte gibt über das Wesen des Geistbesitzes Jesu besonderen Aufschluss; aus ihr muss die Antwort auf die Frage nach dem Wesen des Geistbesitzes Jesu entnommen werden".

Professor Edward Schweizer in his study, "Geist und Gemeinde im neuen Testamentum und heute", says: 'Auf Jesus ist der Geist herabgekommen nicht nur wie auf einen Propheten, sondern so, dass dies Ereignis durch die Gestalt der Taube und die Gottesstimme zur Demonstration Gottes für seinen Sohn wurde.' (Mark 1.10 ff.) Ibid. p.7.

G.W.H.Lampe, "The Seal of the Spirit" p.35, writes: "This 'resting' of the Spirit is of a different quality from the temporary and partial Spirit possession of a prophet. It is continuous and enduring endowment of Jesus with the 'authority' and 'power' (greater than that of the Scribes and prophets), which are manifested in his teaching and mighty works, the Messianic semeia of John 4.10".

v. Also G.W.H.Lampe: "Baptisma" in the New Testament. An article in S.J.T., June 1952, p.167.

There is no doubt whatever that for the primitive Church (die Urgemeinde) the Baptism of Jesus and His receiving of the Holy Spirit had great importance in determining its formulation of Christology. (Not only the Canonical Gospels but also Apocalyptical Writings explain the Baptism of Jesus as the revelation of the fact that the Person of Jesus could only be understood through the Holy Spirit Who was given to Him in Baptism. In the Gospel of Hebrews we read the following passage:-

"factum est autem, cum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus sancti et requieuit super eum et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in aeternum." (1)

-
1. Vide H. B. Swete: "The Holy Spirit in the New Testament" p.39.

Also:

Hans Leisegang: "Pneuma Hegion" p.65

In the Gospel tradition we are familiar with the description of the relationship of Jesus to God as the disclosure of the 'transcendent' (metahistorical) relationship. The thought of the Divine Pre-existence of the Son is implicit in the whole Gospel tradition, but the connection of this thought with the Baptism narrative has not, so far as I know, been sufficiently asserted and appreciated by New Testament scholars as it ought to have been. It is due to reflection on the 'Baptism experience' of Jesus that the problem of the pre-existence of Christ was raised. The intimacy of the words addressed to Jesus in Mark and Luke: "Thou art my beloved Son", or, "This is my beloved Son", in Matthew, spoken as they were at the very beginning of His public ministry, prior even to His 'approval' of God in the wilderness, cannot surely be interpreted to mean that this was due to any 'merit' of Jesus whom God adopts as His Son. Adoptionist Christology cannot justify ethically the experience of Divine Sonship by Jesus in Baptism, either by pointing to the character of the Person of Jesus, for His character is hardly visible here, or by appealing to the arbitrariness of God's choice of Jesus. Rather the truth of this experience of Jesus must be in the fact that/

that God was revealing in the human experience of Jesus, something about this man which is intrinsic to His very Being. And how revealing to a student of the nature of New Testament Revelation, that this 'experience' of the Father and the Son "should be expressed and sealed in by the Holy Spirit, as the very Self of the Father being given to the Son. What has already been said implies a relationship between the Baptism narrative and the Birth narrative stories in Matthew and Luke, and the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. It is the present writer's firm belief that the Gospel tradition as embodied in Matthew, Luke and John, went beyond the Gospel tradition as embodied in Mark, and each of these Gospels was prefaced by, in two cases Birth Narratives, and in the other, the Fourth Gospel, the Prologue, simply to safeguard the understanding of the Baptism of Jesus from any adoptionist interpretation of the Christology, to which Mark lends itself. The Birth narratives are anxious to explain the relationship of Jesus to God revealed in Jesus' baptism as transcending history disclosed even in His miraculous birth which is ascribed to the power of the Holy Spirit. (Mt. i; Lk. i, ii.) The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, while in no wise disputing the assertion of the Birth narratives/

narratives in Matthew and Luke, points beyond the birth of Jesus to the Divine life itself, which is prior to all existence, and says that it is from this life that the meaning of the experience of Baptism may be fully understood, for it has its origin in God who is prior to all things (Jn.i.i ff). By doing this, the Fourth Evangelist not only explains Jesus as the Divine Pre-existent Son ('The Word was God and with God'), but also points to the divine nature of the Holy Spirit who descends upon Jesus in His Baptism, as hidden in the Father, but revealed by the Son as the Divine Self in Whom the Father and the Son know each other.^{1.}

-
1. F.Büchsel (ibid. p.149) is one who is anxious to explain the Baptism of Jesus as the decisive and central event in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus, and in making Jesus the unique 'Pneumatiker' minimises somewhat the pneumatological character of the Birth narratives in Matthew and Luke and also the stories in Luke of the childhood incidents in which Jesus discloses Divine self-knowledge that He was on His Father's business. (Lk. ii.49). But this view of Büchsel is due to his lack of understanding of the inter-relationship between the Baptism and the Birth narratives. The latter were prefaced to the 1st. and 3rd. Gospels to safeguard the meaning of Jesus' Baptism from being interpreted 'adoptionistically'.

C.K.Barret, perhaps under the impact of typology on the study of the Scriptures in our time, gives to the Birth narrative the following interpretation: "We are directed by the Gospel narratives themselves to look to the Old Testament. Doing so we observe what the earliest Christians appear to have seen: that just as the Spirit of God was active at the foundation of the world, so that Spirit was to be expected at the renewal. The conclusion is easily drawn that the entry of the Redeemer upon the stage of history was the work of the Spirit and this accounts for the introduction of the Spirit into the birth narratives". (Barret, ibid. p.23). The criticism of Barret's/

Notes: Contd.

Barret's view is bound up with the criticism of typological theology upon which we cannot enter here. My agreement with Barret is that he understands the birth narrative as being motivated by theological considerations, though he links this theological 'motif' to a different source from myself.

"The problems of dogma are not only historical but meta-historical, and can never be very tightly grappled by the historian. Let us take, for instance, the denial of the Virginal Conception of our Lord. There is first century historical evidence for this, but we who believe it do not really accept it on the ground of that evidence but on the basis of dogma.... On the other hand, those who reject it do not reject it on the basis of evidence either, but on the basis of a counter dogma, which is the very essence of heresy. They do so through their acceptance of the liberal dogma not only of the uniformity of nature, but of the inviolability of the temporal order by the eternal, and its self sufficiency".
Dom Gregory Dix "The Prophet and the Church",
v. Sobornost, December, 1939.

The next problem to consider in connection with teaching of the Synoptic Gospels on the Holy Spirit is that arising from the Temptation narrative (Mk. 1.12 ff). cf. Mt. 4.1-11; Lk.4.1-13). The happenings in the Temptation story are directly related to the Baptism experience and the gift of the Holy Spirit; for it is by being "full of the Holy Spirit", as Luke puts it, that Jesus is led up by the Spirit according to Matthew and Luke and goes into the wilderness to meet the ordeal of the temptations. Mark uses a stronger expression - "The Spirit drove Him into the wilderness".^{1.}

-
1. Mark's terminology here is reminiscent of the Old Testament conception of the Spirit. Prof. Edward Schweitzer perhaps has this example in view when he says: "Markus und grossenteils auch noch Matthaus leben ausserlich noch ganz in den alttestamentlichen Vorstellungen. Sie sehen den Geist Gottes zunächst einmal dort wo ihn die alttestamentlichen Menschen auch gesehen haben: in den aussergewöhnlichen Ereignissen"; (v. "Reformatio", April 1954, p.97) and again, commenting upon the pneumatology of the Gospel of Mark he says: "Er (Markus) muss vor allem andern laug ausoufen in Jesus ist der Gottesgeist wieder da, in Jesus ist Gott gegenwartig geworden - nicht mehr der Gott einer ferner Heiligezeit, von der nur die Bibel etwas erzalt, sondern der Gott hier und heute. Zugespitzt kann man es so formulieren: mit allem, was Markus über den Geist sagt, will er gar nichts über den Geist, sondern nur etwas über Jesus aussagen. Im Geschehen des Heiligen Geistes hat Markus also vor allem das eine erkannt: Jesus ist der, der alle Zusagen Gottes erfuthur der Als der Retter am ENDE der Zeit erscheint; in Jesus ist Gott da." *ibid.* p.199.

Some New Testament scholars see in the Temptation narrative Jesus overcoming the disunity between Him and God His Father, which henceforth marks His life and His work by filial obedience, shewn forth in its completeness and perfection as 'the Beloved Son'.¹.

The Temptation narrative discloses the victory of the Spirit in Jesus which marks him out in the words of/

-
1. Professor Arthur Curtis writes: "In such a being whose love of God and sinful man was perfect to the point of complete self-giving, the Spirit would be found to 'abide' and this steady indwelling and abiding of the Spirit of God in a human life marked the fulfilment of the long process of the self revelation of God to the faith and the resistance of men".

"The Vision and Mission of Jesus" p.24.

of Büchsel as 'Pneumaticker par excellence'. 2.

St. Luke, for whom the Temptation of Jesus in the wilderness was to the victory of the Divine Sonship of Jesus against the disruptive forces in the world which He has come to save, describes this victory as the triumph of the Holy Spirit in Jesus. This is seen in St. Luke's comment upon Jesus' return from the wilderness - "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit unto Galilee". (Lu. 4.14).

It/

-
2. "Die Versuchung die Jesus erfährt kann verstanden werden nur die des Pneumatickers. Ein gewöhnliche Mensch ein Nicht Pneumaticker, erlebt solche Versuchungen nicht. Er steht nicht dem Teufel Auge in Auge gegenüber. Er wird nicht einem über menschlichen Machtbewusstsein, an einem Zutranken, Wunder tun zu können, an dem Triebe die Welt zu beherrschen, gepackt, wenn er versucht wird". Ibid p.173

The narrative of the Temptation has never received the treatment worthy of its spiritual depth, except in the hands of the Russian novelist Dostoyevsky who, in his famous tale, 'The Grand Inquisitor' in 'Brothers Karamazov', says: 'If it were possible to imagine, simply for the sake of argument, that those three questions of the dread Spirit had perished utterly from the books, and that we had to restore them and to invent them anew and gathered together all the wise men of the earth - rulers, chief priest, learned men, philosophers, poets - and had set them the task to invent three questions such as would.... express in three human phrases the whole future history of the world and humanity - dost thou believe that all the wisdom of the earth united could have invented..... equal to the three questions put to thee (Christ - insertion mine) ... in the wilderness? From the miracle of their statements.... we can see that we have here to do with the absolute and the eternal'. op. cit. p.257.

It is with the knowledge of the Divine Sonship held with the awareness of the abiding of the Holy Spirit upon him, that, according to Luke, Jesus inaugurated His public ministry, when in Nazareth on the Sabbath, he stood in the synagogue to read from the books of Isaiah, (61. 1-2) "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me....." Jesus himself added the comment which leaves no doubt that He considered Himself endowed with the Holy Spirit in whose strength He was to embark on His public ministry. His words, "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing", (Lu. 4.21) reveal a complete awareness that through the Holy Spirit which was upon Him, His destiny and mission were taken up from the chances of human history into God's purpose for the world, and as such must be made known to others, and known by others, if they are to be participants in this dealing of God with men in Christ. F. Buchsel sees in this instance reported by Luke an example of genuine Gospel tradition and is anxious to show that, although Mark and Matthew do not report it directly, it is implied in their Gospels when they record that the preaching of Jesus had made an extraordinary impact on the audiences and had aroused the resentment of the Rabbis. It shines through the words/

words that Jesus preached as the Pneumatik. (Büchsel bases his judgment upon Mark 1.21 ff., Matthew 7.29 - Büchsel ibid p.150).

I have already touched on the pneumatic character of Jesus' teaching. H.B.Swete comments on it thus: "The word of the Lord does not come to Him at intervals as it came to the prophets of old; all that he said was said in the Spirit. The words of Jesus in Mark 13.31 'Heaven and earth will pass away but my word will not pass away' Swete interprets in the light of the unique possession of the Spirit by Jesus. (Swete ibid p.58).

His pneumatic preaching is directly related to the pneumatic character of his miracles. (In the Gospel of Matthew, 12.15 ff. Jesus' healing miracles reveal Him as the servant of Isaiah upon whom the Spirit of God rests). Even the enemies of Jesus acknowledge the supernatural power manifested in His miracles, but they ascribe it to the demoniac possession of Jesus. And here we meet one of the most difficult problems of our study in the Synoptic Gospels - "The Sin against the Holy Spirit" (Mk. 3.28; cf. Mt. 31 ff; Lu. 12.10).

Mark and Matthew explain that this pronouncement came after the 'Beelzebub Controversy', in which Jesus' enemies explained the work of Jesus as inspired by Beelzebub/,

Beelzebub, the prince of devils. Jesus retorts: "How can Satan cast out Satan" and reveals the shallowness of their accusation which would mean that Satan had risen against himself to destroy his own kingdom, which is hardly reasonable. Evil cannot redeem itself by itself - it only multiplies itself. Jesus says that rather one should see in this that I, by the Spirit of God, cast out demons and that the Kingdom of God is offered you. But there is one thing which may debar you from it: your own blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (Matthew 12.28).

Of what does this blasphemy consist? Simply in this: that the Holy Spirit, being God's Truth, self-authenticates Himself in His manifestation for all those who live close to God and who therefore live in the Light of the Holy Spirit. Not to be able to recognise the Holy Spirit when He manifests Himself, or to interpret Him as evil, shows that those who do so have departed from God and that they cannot recognise Him when He stretches out His hand to them to heal and save. In this whole problem, the central point is this: Jesus pronounced against the 'blasphemy of the Holy Spirit' because his enemies, full of hatred and prejudice, were unable to see the work of the Holy Spirit in Him. It is this which throws so much light on the study of the problem 'Jesus and the Spirit' and leaves no uncertainty for the student of/

of the New Testament that the Christology in the Synoptic tradition is bound up with the Pneumatology, and the other way round, and that Jesus and the Spirit in the Gospels are co-interpretative of each other.¹

-
1. Due to many wrong interpretations of the meaning of Mark 3.28, it is right to repeat what has been already said in more direct language. The whole contention of Mark 3.28, with its parallels in Matthew and Luke, is simply to show that the Holy Spirit 'abode' in Jesus in an absolute sense, and that the Holy Spirit in the life and work of Jesus revealed Himself. Not to recognise this and to speak of Him adversely as an 'unclean' spirit (Mark 3.30) was the unforgivable sin, the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which revealed that those who thus blasphemed were so fallen away from God that the revelation of Him in Jesus was not only unrecognisable, but seemed demoniac. This reviling of Jesus showed that such who did it were siding with the Devil, the adversary of God, and as enemies of God in their enmity have gone so far that they cannot even repent as they have deliberately extinguished the light of their conscience, by their prejudices to the extent that it turned from the light of truth into the darkness of evil, where evil is called one's good.

In Matthew and Luke a comparison is made between the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit, the sin against the Son of Man being forgivable, while the sin against the Holy Spirit is not. (Mark's version says: 'All sins will be forgiven the sons of men.... but whatsoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness'). Theodore Rusch explains this by saying: 'Zwar ist die Gegenwart Gottes in Jesus verborgen, weshalb Lasterende gegen den 'Menschensohn' möglich aber vergebar ist. (Matt.12.32) Das Pheuma Hagion im Menschensohn verhüllt gegenwärtig. Die Lasterende gegen das Pheuma Hagion als gegen die unmittelbare Gegenwart Gottes wird aber dem Menschen, der Sie erkannt hat, jedoch lastert, die endgültige Katastrophe bringen. (Mark 3.28-30) Der Mensch der dem "Menschensohn" begegnet, wird also die bedeutsamste Entscheidung seines Lebens fallen, in dem er entweder der in Jesus Christus erschienenen Gegenwart Gottes glaubet, oder hier das Nahesein eines 'unreinen Geistes', (Mark 3.30) behauptet". Ibid p.28

Notes: Contd.

InNotes: Contd.

th

PrIn view of the identification of the conception of spoken of as the Son of Man in the New Testament, makes an exception in the Matthew and Luke usage, and understands it as having no Christological reference, here meaning a man only. This is very important because it shows what I have been anxious to point out - that the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is precisely in not seeing Him in Jesus and His work. New Testament Pneumatology must insist on this by virtue of the unique character of Jesus' possession of the Spirit. (This note is taken from Professor Cullmann's lectures already referred to).

In this connection it seems appropriate to discuss the saying in Matthew 12.28 and its corresponding metaphor in Luke 11.20. In the Matthew version the words of Jesus are reported thus: "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons then the Kingdom of God has come upon you". In Luke, the metaphor 'the finger of God' is used instead of the Holy Spirit. This had led many New Testament scholars to speak of the Luke version as more primitive and more genuine. The idea of the Coming of the Kingdom of God as the manifestation of the power of the Holy Spirit who was upon him, is implied in the whole self-consciousness of Jesus. And the Luke metaphor 'the finger of God' stands precisely for the same reality of which Matthew speaks, for in the Old Testament the metaphor 'the finger of God' denoted the Spirit of God, and therefore these two versions should not be played the one against the other, as is done by E.F.Scott. v. "The Spirit in the New Testament", p.74.

Commenting upon Matthew 12.28 Rusch says: "In der Zeit seiner Knechtsgestalt sind die Macht taten, die er vollbringt in der Kraft des Geistes Zeichen für sein Pneumatisches Leben, Hinweise auf die in ihm erschienene Gegengewort Gottes". Ibid p.28

The same is the case with the saying in Luke ascribed to Jesus, 11.13. "If you then... how much more will the Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him". The Matthew version has instead of the Holy Spirit 'good things'. (Matt. 7.11) H.B.Swete thinks that the Matthew version is genuine, as the mention of the Holy Spirit by Luke is an interpretation in the Light of the Pentecost. (ibid p.120) For Jesus the Pneumatic, the rendering of Luke is the most natural to come from His lips.

The next problem of the Pneumatology of the New Testament is the passage in Mark 13.11 with its parallels in Matthew 10, 19, 20 and Luke 12.11-12, where Jesus warns his disciples about the enmity of their fellowmen which expressed itself by bringing His followers before the synagogues, the rulers and the authorities. Jesus encourages them not to be anxious how to defend themselves and the Gospel entrusted to them, for the Holy Spirit will be their teacher and their advocate. Here we touch on the Pneumatology with which the Fourth Gospel deals more fully. On this point the Synoptic and the Johannine tradition of Pneumatology cross each other; each enhances from the point of view of theological study the tradition of the Spirit as the Promise of Jesus as the Comforter to His Followers in His stead. More will be said about this in the second chapter of this essay. It suffices here to note that this part of synoptic pneumatology has not been overlooked in our study.

There is in the Synoptic tradition another reference to the Holy Spirit. In Mark 12.36, (cf. Matthew 22,41-46) the ideas expressed in the writings of the Old Testament, (Ps. 110,1) are ascribed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. That the primitive Church shares in this conviction/

conviction is seen from the Second Letter to Timothy (3.16). While there are no doubts that Jesus shared this view, the question only remains whether Jesus said this because it was natural to expect Him to do so. This 'naturalness' may have been responsible for the writer or the later interpolator to put unconsciously the reference to the Holy Spirit in this connection into the mouth of Jesus. (Luke makes no mention of the Holy Spirit).

Two more places in the Synoptic Gospels need to be considered before the discussion of individual passages of the Synoptic tradition in regard to the teaching on the Holy Spirit is ended. First Luke, 10.21, and Matthew 28.19.

The passage in Luke which Raymond George calls "Jesus' Prayer of Joy"¹, says that Jesus rejoiced in an act of exultation caused by the mission of the Seventy experiencing the power of the Gospel of their Master's teaching. Jesus attached great significance to this moment which he reveals in his words: "I saw a Satan fall like lightning from Heaven", and Luke then adds: "He, Jesus, rejoiced in the Holy Spirit". Two comments must be made before we can evaluate the full pneumatological significance of this passage. First, it seems/

1. Raymond George: op.cit. p.37

seems clear that this joy is occasioned by the vision through this mission of future progress and success of His work, when the Disciples, trusting in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will continue His work. Added to this is His experience of the Divine closeness of God whom He has once more experienced in the opening of the eyes of His disciples to see the revelation of God in Jesus; through His gospel they preached^{on} their mission. The Holy Spirit whom Jesus has known in Himself, and in the fulfilment of His own mission, he sees here prophetically being given to His disciples for the same purpose. So Lucan terminology is indeed apt. "He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit". For with what other joy could He thank God His Father but by the Holy Spirit in whom the Father had declared Him as the Son and He had known God as His Father, and in whom also His mission had inaugurated the Kingdom of God, which He foresaw in the mission of His disciples being extended through history. Raymond George¹ says that here Luke had perhaps the Pauline teaching in his mind, but it seems that its setting is very natural in the Synoptic tradition, and there is no reason to accept R. George's view. It is right in what it says but only in so far as New Testament theology/

1. Ibid p.37

theology expresses (what New Testament scholars, and in particular Professor O.Cullmann, have now come to see more clearly), the inner interdependence and inter-relatedness of the whole New Testament.

The passage in Matthew is the well-known baptismal formula that the baptism be administered in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. In this passage this formula is interpreted as the command of Jesus after the Resurrection (Mt. 28.19). It has been described by some New Testament scholars as a much later interpolation¹.

Speaking theologically, and not discussing textual criticism, the student of Pneumatology in the Synoptics is aware of the tendency to treat the Holy Spirit in the New Testament in terms of the Old Testament understanding of the Spirit as Professor Edward Schweizer has shown.

1. "Very possibly the trinitarian formula is a reflection back into the narrative of the practice of the early church".... T.H.Robinson, "The Gospel of Matthew", The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, p.237".

H.B.Swete, however, argues that some scholars have established without a "shadow of doubt or uncertainty", the genuineness of Matthew 28.19

Ibid p.123

"..... and if the connection of baptism with the Three-fold Name is due to the editor, yet the conception of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is clearly as ancient as the Christian Society itself".

W.C.Allen: Gospel acc. St. Matthew I.C.C. p.306.

shown. "Darum erscheinen auch so wenige Geistaussagen... Der Geist ist ja nicht grundsätzlich anderes verstanden in Alten Testament, darum wollen die Evangelisten keine neue Lehre über ihn bieten. Ebensowenig kann es ihr Anliegen sein, Jesus als Pneumatiker zu schildern; damit halten sie ihn ja weder von den alt testamentlichen Propheten und Gerechten noch von den new testamentlichen Pneumatiken unterschieden. Ihr Ziel ist es doch gerade, Jesus als den eschatologischen Retter zu schildern als den, in den, in dem Gott gegenwärtig ist, wie er nie und nirgends vor ihm gegenwärtig war."¹.

Nevertheless in spite of the tendency of the Synoptics to think in terms of the Old Testament understanding of the Holy Spirit, their picture of Jesus reveals that for Him the Holy Spirit was not an impersonal force, an enthusiasm, but the personal reality in which He was aware of His Divine Sonship and knew God as His Father. To Him the Holy Spirit was the abiding Divine presence, intimately related to His own selfhood. While He knew God as the Father through the Holy Spirit, nevertheless the Father is spoken of as one who is 'in heaven', (Matt. 6.9). When at the end of the Gospel of Matthew we find Jesus' own description of God as the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, the student of New Testament pneumatology/

1. Ibid p.7

logy sees this "trinity" implied in Jesus' consciousness of God, as He follows Jesus as the Christ revealing His self consciousness as the Pneumatic par excellence in the Synoptic Gospels.

* * * * *

Here we have now brought the survey of the passages in the Synoptic Gospels on the teaching concerning the Holy Spirit to an end. By this survey we have been trying to let them reveal their full meaning by systematic presentation in order to understand fully the depth of the revelation of God in Christ. Now we turn to reflection on the study of our subject.

The first reaction of many students is the inadequacy of the material on the subject. "Why", they say, "if the Holy Spirit meant so much in the life of Jesus, did He say so little about it?" It is to the understanding of this problem that we turn in the remaining section of this chapter¹.

The understanding of the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels must not be sought in the sayings of Jesus alone, but also in His own consciousness of the Divine Sonship, which underlies all that Jesus was, thought, or did. Throughout runs His own awareness of finality, that in Him/

1. This problem also raised the understanding of the finality of the revelation of God in Christ which will also be discussed later.

Him God has uniquely spoken and that He has surpassed every authority which claimed to speak on God's behalf. Here, too, His teaching is characterised by the mark of authority which His hearers recognised and acknowledged. (Mark 1.22; cf. Matt. 7.28 ff; Luke 4.31 ff)¹.

According to Harnack, Jesus knew Himself as the embodiment of the authority and the finality of God's Revelation in Him. "Undoubtedly", says Harnack, "there is in this 'I have come', whatever it means, something authoritative and final"². But it is in the interpretation of this finality and authority of the revelation of God in Christ that the real problem arises. The nature of the interpretation becomes crucial for the whole of the Christology and the Pneumatology of the New Testament.

The finality of the revelation of God in Christ as presented in the New Testament meets us as a paradox. This/

1. In this chapter it is assumed that through the Gospel tradition, it is possible for us 'to meet Jesus' in His own person, and interpret the New Testament revelation in the light which His personality throws upon it. The view of Professor Rudolf Bultmann, that this is an impossible and hopeless task because in the Gospels we only find "the Kerygma", the primitive Church's interpretation of the teaching of Jesus, behind which we cannot go, nor can we assume for it any objectivity in the knowledge of Jesus of Himself, will not be followed.

V. Appendix on Professor Bultmann at the end of this thesis.

2. vide Barret, *ibid* p.95

This finality is not impaired by being expressed in the human existence of a man, Jesus, who like all men was subject to the limitations of the particular time in history and the particular space and country in which he lived. Nor is this finality, even though it was the historic experience of the man Jesus, annihilated as an historic reality binding other men by its claim, after the Ascension of Jesus. If this was so, the problem would not raise so many difficulties. We would only have to account by an analysis of the Gospel record how it came about that Jesus had such consciousness. Such an analysis as that expressed by G.W.H.Lampe would suffice: "The descent of the Spirit was directly connected with the heavenly proclamation of the Lord's Divine Sonship; indeed His possession of the Spirit, which fulfilled the traditional expectation of the Messiah, has as its immediate consequence, the declaration and realisation of his status as the Son of God; Sonship and the Spirit possession are in effect identical. This 'resting' of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus..... is not a possession by an impersonal force, but a state of union with God the Father".¹

1. Seal of the Spirit, p.35

But the finality of the Revelation of God in Christ of which we speak, is of importance to us here and now. It claims us as the meaning of our existence and the key to the understanding of our own destiny. How to explain this meaningfully and to give full justice to the New Testament revelation is a most difficult task. It seems clear that Christology while it accepts such views as those of G.W.H. Lampe as a starting point, must be carried further to explain the problem of the finality of the revelation of God in Christ in order to make it intelligible, how it is that this finality grasps us and is relevant for us. This problem can only be answered by pointing to the implications of Jesus' possession of the Holy Spirit. Jesus received the Holy Spirit to the fullest extent possible for a human existence. This is the meaning of the words in the Fourth Gospel: "To Him, God gave not the Spirit by measure unto Him". (John 3.34 A.V.) The Holy Spirit, therefore, takes into Himself fully the human existence of Jesus and the revelation of God in it; and since the Holy Spirit stands in every age of history as its contemporary, the revelation of God in Christ meets us in the Holy Spirit and interprets God in relation to human existence, and reveals the meaning of human existence for God. Thus the/

the whole of history is related and gathered in the revelation of God in Christ. That Jesus Himself knew His own existence thus realised may be argued from His promise of the Holy Spirit to His disciples, to which we have made passing reference. The promise of the Holy Spirit is implied in His own unique possession of the Holy Spirit¹. That is why the Holy Spirit, who was by Jesus fully received into history, will henceforth abide in history, though Jesus Himself must be taken from it. For the existence of Jesus as the revelation of God through the resting upon Him of the Holy Spirit, becomes creative of fellowship with other human existences throughout all history. Through this fellowship they become partakers of the Holy Spirit who eternally rests upon them as God's gift to them. Thus through this fellowship of human historic existences with Jesus as the Christ, the Holy Spirit continues through Christ to abide in history, making the revelation of God in Christ ever present reality to the whole of history, which takes its meaning from it and converges on it as its centre. Conversely it may be said that it is the Holy Spirit who creates fellowship of individual/

1. This explains the apparent paradox in the Fourth Gospel where in the promise of the Holy Spirit He speaks of the Father giving them another Counsellor - and adds that He Himself will come to them. (Jn. 14.16 ff).

individual human beings with Christ down history and makes them partakers in Christ's victory over sin and death.¹ Only Jesus' consciousness of the presence of the Holy Spirit, who rested on Him, can explain the note of assurance and triumph which the promise of the Holy Spirit to the disciples contains. (Mk. 13.11; Mt. 10, 19.20-; Lu. 12.11-12).

The consciousness of the Spirit possession explains also the authority and finality of God's revelation in Jesus implied in His: "I am come" (Mt. 5.17), and all "I say to you" passages in the Synoptic Gospels. The promise of the Spirit to the disciples in the Synoptic Gospels is mentioned in connection with their missionary task. In the Gospel of Luke, the first missionary enterprise of the disciples is the occasion of Jesus' "Prayer of Joy", the pneumatological significance of which has already been discussed. The words of Jesus which preceded this prayer "I saw a Satan fall like lightning from Heaven" must be understood as the finality of God's victory over evil in the world, through Jesus the Christ./

1. F. Buchsel on John 3.34: Der Satz *ὁ πατήρ ἐκ ἑωυτοῦ δίδωμι τὸ πνεῦμα* begründet direct den anderen, dass der Gottesgesante Gottes Worte redet. Hier is aufs deutlichste der Geistesbesitz als die eigentliche Quelle der Wiksamkeit Jesu genant. Deshalb ist das Herabkimmen und Bleiben des Geistes auf Jesus auch das Zeichen, an dem der Berufene Zeuge Jesu, Taufer, ihn erkennen kann".

Ibid p.490 ff.

Christ. (The finality of God's victory is also the finality of God's revelation). This must be understood in the sense that Jesus experienced the Unity of His being with the Holy Spirit, that He saw His own mission carried out and fulfilled as the mission of the Spirit in Jesus' name in future.

To sum up: the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels is the Divine Self (Divine Presence) through whom Jesus' own Self realised the knowledge and consciousness of Himself as the Word of God, the Son of God, the Messiah, (in the sense of the Suffering Servant), God's complete revelation to history and God's answer to man's questions about the meaning of human existence and history. Is this too high a claim for the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic tradition? It seems to me the inevitable conclusion from our studies in this section. I confess that at least to one student of the New Testament, the Synoptic tradition which presents Jesus as the Christ, the revelation of God in history, is not intelligible in any other way.¹

1. There have been many interpretations accounting for the lack of references to the Holy Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels. Here are noted some of them:

"It is significant that in no case does Christ speak of the Holy Spirit as acting upon His followers while He is present with them. He would keep the thought of the disciples upon Himself as the revelation of the Father".

Irving Wood, op.cit.p.137.

"Jesus was the Messiah, as such He was the bearer of the Spirit, but He kept His Messiahship secret, and knew Himself to be a Messiah destined for suffering/

Notes: Contd.

"suffering and death; hence it might be expected that the Spirit which rested upon Him would not be openly and entirely manifest. And so it was..... Jesus Himself hardly ever spoke of the Spirit, He could not have done so.... without declaring the Messiahship which it was His purpose to keep secret".

Barret, ibid p.120

"And though the Holy Spirit came openly after the departure of the Lord's bodily presence, He secretly accompanied Him during all the days of His earthly ministry!"

H. Watkins Jones, op.cit. p.338

* * * * *

The Pneumatology of the Synoptic Gospels begins with the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at His Baptism when His Divine Sonship is disclosed and it reaches its climax in the promise of the Holy Spirit to the disciples. The nature and significance of this promise are the special themes of the Fourth Evangelist who dwells on it more fully and it is to the study of the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel that we now turn.

* * * * *

APPENDIX.The Pneumatic Nature of the Miracles of Jesus.

Any study of the miracles of Jesus apart from the study of the person of Jesus is a hopeless task. Bultmann's suggestion that the study of the personality of any great man is of no significance for another man's existence, while the study of his deeds is, (for from them one learns about one's own possibilities of existence), although it may be true in relation to other human personalities, is not true with regard to Jesus, for the simple reason that, unless we have some key to His person the meaning of His deeds is a riddle which evades our understanding. As regards the miracles of Jesus, the student of the Gospel narrative is aware that there is something secondary about the miracles themselves. They are not acts which can stand out by themselves, as is the case with many acts of human compassion. Jesus Himself, according to the Gospel narrative, was aware of this and strictly forbade those whom He healed to publicise the fact. (Mat. 9.30). This is in accordance with the Temptation narrative, which records that Jesus renounced any power of thaumaturgy for its own or His sake, but subjected the power within Himself to perform miracles only as the expression of the glory and love of God, Who has revealed Himself as His Father. Thus, the miracles of Jesus are signs of Revelation, described in the Gospels as the presence of God's Kingdom in the world (Mt. 12,28 cf. Lk. 11,20). The idea of the Kingdom of God which Jesus saw revealed in Him and by Him is only intelligible if we connect it with Jesus' experience of the abiding of the Holy Spirit upon Him, as Jesus Himself according to St. Matthew acknowledged it. (Mt. 12,28). This explains why the miracles of Jesus differ from the thaumaturgy of pagan miracle workers, who sought on the evidence of their miracles to establish their claim of being superhuman. It also explains a peculiar characteristic of the miracles of Jesus, namely the conquest by the presence of eschatological reality in them of the demoniac element in thaumaturgy, which is due to the egocenteredness of those who perform miracles. The last point which is connected with the revelatory nature of the miracles of Jesus can be explained satisfactorily only in pointing to the finality of Divine Revelation in Jesus the Christ. This finality, already discussed, comes/

comes from Jesus' own surrender of His human existence in obedience to the Holy Spirit who rested upon Him, and also from the surrender by the Holy Spirit of His own Self to the human existence of Jesus, Whom He thus revealed as the Christ. Thus, a right understanding of the miracles of Jesus can only be grasped when they are linked up with the idea of 'The Kingdom'. The idea of the Kingdom of God came to Jesus precisely from this consciousness of the bond between Himself and the Holy Spirit. (This bond is constituted by the surrender of the human existence of Jesus to the Spirit and of the Spirit to Jesus). This in turn explains the double nature of the Kingdom in the Gospels, its immanence in the world and its transcendence of the world (being not of this world).

(The reference to Professor R. Bultmann is taken from his book "Jesus", p. 13. Deutche Bibliothek, Berlin, 1926.

* * * * *

2. THE PNEUMATOLOGY OF THE IVTH.GOSPEL.

The Pneumatology of the IVth.Gospel is best studied after a study of pneumatology in the Synoptic Gospels rather than after a study of the pneumatology in Pauline theology as some New Testament scholars would suggest.¹ A study of the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel reveals its essential identity with the pneumatology of the Synoptics, whose teaching it attempts to correct and amplify.²

-
1. Vide Edward Schweizer: Der Heilige Geist in Neuen Testament, Reformation, April 1954, and also E.F.Scott: The Fourth Gospel, p.330.
 2. The Fourth Gospel has been dismissed by many New Testament scholars as containing no genuine tradition. Professor Bultmann in his book 'Jesus' expresses this view very sharply: "Das Johannes Evangelium kommt als Quelle für die Verkündigung Jesu überhaupt nicht in Betracht". (op. cit. p.16). There are signs in New Testament scholarship at present which show a more constructive attitude to the Gospel tradition of the Fourth Gospel and instead of following views such as Bultmann give a fresh evaluation. v. especially Oscar Cullmann: "Early Christian Worship", II part. S.C.M. Press, 1953.

The Fourth Gospel is at one with the Synoptics in describing the Baptism of Jesus as revelatory of his Divine Sonship and authenticated by the Holy Spirit resting upon Him. (John 1.32 ff). The difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics lies in the understanding of the meaning of Baptism. In the Synoptics the Baptismal experience seems to be directed towards Jesus in whom the experience brought about the consciousness of Divine Sonship. The fourth evangelist, unlike the Synoptics, insists that the revelation of the divine character of the person of Jesus in his historical life, was not that Jesus should know himself to be divine, for he carried in himself the knowledge of his eternal, (pre-existent) Divine Sonship. The events in the life of Jesus such as Baptism were meant to reveal to others his divinity that they might know and bear witness that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God. In this knowledge and bearing the witness lies salvation of man. (Such a one was John the Baptist). In the Fourth Gospel the Holy Spirit as manifested in the Baptism of Jesus, reveals on the plane of history that Jesus is the Incarnate Logos, who eternally abides with God and is God. His divine being is revealed through the eternal resting upon him of the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father, (Jn.15,26) and in whom the Father is revealed to the Son and the Son to the Father.

The same Holy Spirit has a mission in the earthly existence of Jesus the Christ, the Incarnate Word, to reveal Him to the world also. In the Holy Spirit Christ inaugurates the Kingdom of God, (or the new life), which for all those who enter therein is new birth by the Spirit. (John 3.6)¹.

-
1. "The birth by the Spirit" is linked up in the Fourth Gospel with 'water' - that is the repentance of sins, sealed by the sign of water baptism. John the Baptist preached the repentance of sins and administered water baptism but he could not baptise with the Spirit. This only belongs to Jesus The Christ, John 1.33. Hence the presence of Jesus The Christ in the world is the presence of the Kingdom of God. In Jesus The Christ God manifests His own very self. This is the meaning of the saying of the IVth. Gospel: "God is Spirit and those who worship Him in spirit and truth" (John 4.24). The Spirit for the Fourth Evangelist, as Edward Schweizer says, is the world of God, but this ought not to be understood in terms of human interpretation of God as in Greek philosophy, whereby God is a heavenly substance which "die ganze Welt durchdringe oder die in Menschlichen Geiste wiederzufinden ware. Dass er im Geiste und in der Wahrheit angebetet werden muss, heisst nicht etwas: im menschlichen Geiste (im Unterschied zu Kultischen Ausserlichkeiten zum Beispiel). Die 'Wahrheit' is ja nur an einem einzigen Ort zu finden, beidem der von sich selbst erklart: Ich bin die Wahrheit (14.6) Im Geist anbeten heisst also nicht anbeten im Bewusstsein der eigenen Geistsubstanz oder gar in einer Geistigkeit, die sich von allem ausseren Bekenntnis fluchten will. Es heisst: ihn nicht mehr anbeten in der Spure des 'Fleisches', das heisst in all den menschlichen Moglichkeiten und Denkkategorien (wozn gerade die 'Geistigkeit' des Menschen gehort!); sondern in seiner eigenen spure, so wie er selbst sich uns zeigt - namelich in seinem Sohn. Dort und dort slein ist ja die Welt des 'Geistes' herein gebrochen in unsere Welt. Weil Jesus 'von oben' kommt weil in ihm Gott selbst zu finden ist, darum ist in ihm die Welt des Geistes da, und nicht etwa bloss weil er allerlei aussergewohnliche Taten gettan hatte). Reformatio
ibid p.208

Therefore he, the Christ, whom God has sent, in Himself reveals that "God gives not the Spirit by measure unto him," (Jn. 3.34 A.V.) In Jesus the Christ, who comes from God, the Holy Spirit continually abides making God's selfhood and the life of Jesus the Christ intercommunicable to each other. It is here that the full meaning and implication of the saying in John 1.14, "The Word became flesh", is disclosed.

It is the pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel which enriches the Christology of the Fourth Gospel. It is unrealistic to think as E.F. Scott does, that the Christology of the Fourth Gospel could reveal its own depths so richly without its pneumatology. Hence I am compelled to assert that in this respect his book "The Fourth Gospel", shows great misunderstanding and theological unrealism when he says: "The more closely we examine the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, the more we are compelled to acknowledge that there is no real place for it in the theology as a whole" (op.cit.347).

* * * * *

Now we turn to the study of the main part of the pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel, the promise of the Holy Spirit as 'the Paraclete' in Christ's stead after Christ's/

Christ's physical presence has been taken from the disciples (Jn. 14, 16,26; 15,26; 16,7)¹.

These passages in which the Holy Spirit is promised are found in the Fourth Gospel in a setting which describes Jesus' intimation to the disciples of his own imminent departure and their consequent sorrow, (Jn.16,5)². But the meaning of these passages while aimed at producing an encouraging effect upon the disciples extends far beyond the realm of psychology. Its objective was to reveal to the disciples the mystery of the Revelation of God in Christ, which from now on will be interpreted by the Holy Spirit as 'another Counsellor' (Jn.14,16). Until now God has been present in the world in Christ, (to use Pauline terminology which fully expresses Johannine faith) in Whom "all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell" (cf. Jn.1,14. Col. 1,19). The Holy Spirit who abode in Christ authenticated this truth about Christ/

1. The pneumatological significance of John 7.39 will be studied at the end of these passages. The reason for this will be shown later.
2. This setting has been responsible for translating of the Greek 'Ho PaRaklytos' as The Comforter, English; Utyeshitely, Slavonic; Der Troster, German, Luther.

Christ in manifesting His own power in preaching and the works of Christ. But from now on the Christ will be present in the Spirit in the world as the Spirit was present in the Christ. This will not mean the annihilation of the revelation of God in Christ, but the disclosure of its transcendent character and its fulfilment. Christ henceforth will not be, as he was in his earthly ministry, conditioned by categories of human existence such as time and space, but He will be placed beyond time and history and will subject both to Himself instead of being subject to them. In the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples of Jesus, the person of Jesus and the revelation of God in Him will, through the Holy Spirit, reveal new depths and significance. In other words the Christocentricity of Divine Revelation will become Pneumatocentric as well. What this means will become clearer later but, stated briefly, it may be said that the meaning of the pneumatological character of the Christocentricity of Divine Revelation is to reveal fully what this Gospel tries to show from its very beginning - that the Father and the Son are one. The coming of the Paraclete will reveal this as a living reality for the disciples, since the Holy Spirit will dwell in them (Jn. 14,17) and will make them partakers of this oneness of the Father and the Son, (Jn. 17,21). The meaning of the/

the Holy Spirit in this section of the Fourth Gospel is that the Holy Spirit reveals to the believer, that in Christ, God and man are not external to one another and that this is a new and unique possibility brought by Christ and realised in the Holy Spirit who is Christ's gift to those who believe on Him.

In this lies the answer to the problem which has puzzled some students of Johannine theology, namely the 'triadic' formula in which the disciples take the third place, "which", says Raymond George, "in other contexts might be given to the Spirit", as for example in John 14,20 and 17,21 (ibid.p.205). To state the case briefly, the disciples taking of the place of the Spirit in these triadic formulae is only apparent. Their participation in the Unity of the Father and the Son only reveals that this unity also extends to the Holy Spirit who dwells in them.⁺

+ Theo Preiss: "Das innere Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes p.17, "Ist der Geist vom Sohn und vom Vater verschieden, so ist er auch mit ihnen verbunden, dass beide, der Vater und der Sohn, im Geiste gegenwärtig sind und in ihn wirken (Jn. 14,18-23). Wie niemand den Vater kennt ausser dem Sohn, so kennt den Sohn und den Vater ausser dem Geist des Vaters und Sohns. Und wie alles Wissen, alles Leben und alles Sein Gottes dem Sohn gegeben worden sind, so kennt auch der Geist alle Dinge und erforscht alles selbst die Tiefen Gottes (I Kor.2.10-13)"

The truth of this indwelling is revealed in their experience of their participation in the unity of the Father and the Son. This participation of the disciples in this unity is mediated by the Holy Spirit whose kenetic nature is such that he almost fades in the act of exalting those whom he indwells, e.g. Christ and now His disciples. We hope to justify this statement by a closer study of the pneumatological passages under discussion where the promise of the Spirit is described in the following terms.

* * * * *

A. The disciples are not to think that Christ's departure will mean that they are left alone and will be cut off from the immediacy of God's presence. The Father will give them another Counsellor (Paraclete) through Christ's prayer (Jn. 14,16). This sending is described in John 15,26. cf. 16,7, as the sending of the Holy Spirit as well by Christ Himself. "The procession" of the Holy Spirit is described as from the Father (ibid 15,26), the meaning of which seems to be what the Fourth Evangelist is anxious to explain, that the revelation of God in Christ is the testimony of the Son to the Father and the Father to the Son and the Holy Spirit himself, whose being is in the very depths of God, is this testimony both in its Godward and manward side. This/

This is seen from the following sentence where the purpose of the coming of the Holy Spirit is described as being to witness concerning Christ (Jn. 15,36; cf. Jn.16,14)¹. The purpose of this witness is to reveal Christ to men that they also may bear witness to the Christ, for the bearing of this witness shows that man abides in God and God in Him. The witness to Christ reveals man's knowledge of God as He really is:- the unity of the Father and the Son. (We will later on in this thesis return once more to the problem of 'the procession').

* * * * *

B. The Paraclete will abide for ever with the disciples. This 'abiding' in fact constitutes discipleship which reveals the inward presence of the Spirit in the life of the disciple. The world, however, will not receive the Holy Spirit because it neither sees Him nor knows Him. (Jn. 14,16). In this verse the meaning of the word 'the world', the Greek 'Kosmos' in this Gospel, is made clear as human beings in which the Holy Spirit is not operative/

1. "The content of the Paraclete message is the Son, whom he will glorify by continuously taking of the Son's revelation and declaring its meaning to the disciples.... the Spirit is thus an alter ego of the Son".
L. Thornton: "The Incarnate Lord" - p.349, 1928.

operative owing to their non-acceptance of Jesus as the Christ. The disciples, however, will possess the Holy Spirit because they knew Christ. This is the meaning of the words: "You know Him (the Holy Spirit) for He dwells with you". This constant dwelling of the Holy Spirit with the disciples must be understood as the witness of Christ to the abiding of the Holy Spirit upon Him. Faith in Jesus as the Christ is the instrument of the future indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the disciples. (Jn. 14,17).

* * * * *

C. He, the Holy Spirit, will be the teacher and the guardian of the Revelation of God in Christ. "He will teach you all things and bring to remembrance all that I have said to you". (Jn. 14,26)¹.

They, the disciples, were exhorted not to be anxious about the 'witness to Christ in the hostile world. The Holy Spirit will aid them. (Here the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel echoes that of the Synoptics in Mk.13.11; Mt.10.19 ff; Lk. 12.11 ff.) The very fact that the disciples/

1. This verse is responsible for the statement of Norman Snaith: "The word Paraclete means Convictor rather than Comforter.... the Holy Spirit is not that Spirit which comforts the disciples.... but rather that Spirit which convinces them of the truth of the things of Christ", op. cit. p. 180/1. To this may be added that the meaning of the Paraclete thus rendered is legitimate but it is impossible to convey the meaning of the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel with any single word at least in European languages.

disciples had been from the very beginning with Jesus, was due to their being inspired and strengthened by the Holy Spirit who rested on Jesus. And how much more would that be the case when the Holy Spirit became their inner reality. (Jn. 15,26,27). In this lies the key to the understanding of the words of Jesus: 'It is to your advantage that I go away' (Jn. 16,17). In this verse is revealed the self renunciation of God on man's behalf. In order to make him stand on his own feet, God will retire from man's sight and strengthen him from within, and will give him the knowledge that he is not a puppet but a free being with the power of his own subjectivity. But a misunderstanding of this situation possesses a great temptation for man. (Of this more will be spoken of elsewhere in this thesis.) The witness of the disciples to the world in preaching the Gospel will be preceded and aided by the struggle of the Spirit with the world on behalf of Christ. He, the Holy Spirit, will convince the world of its sin and unrighteousness and of judgment. (Jn. 16,7 ff). Sin is disbelief in Jesus as the Christ. Faith in Him conquers sin. Righteousness for the Fourth Evangelist consists of the act of accomplishment of God's will in history in the life of Jesus the Christ. Hence follows the description of righteousness as the return of Christ to the Father as the proof of the accomplishment of God's purpose in the world in Christ. All that does not show forth the relation/

relation to God and man, expressed in the life of Jesus the Christ is under judgment. The 'ruler' of this world is under judgment above all others, as in him the rebellion against God has reached a climax, but his claim upon the world has been laid bare as false by Christ and the claim of God upon the world established by Christ by whom God has created the world.(Jn.1.3).

* * * * *

D. For the disciples it was expedient that Christ should go away. His physical presence prevented the Revelation of God in Christ from becoming their subjective reality. His earthly form prevented the disciples from knowing all truth. The meaning of truth here is the knowledge that the Revelation of God in Christ is not limited to the time of Christ's earthly existence. The disciples will learn this truth in the Holy Spirit who is the Spirit of Truth. (Jn. 14,17). In the Holy Spirit the true nature of the Divine purpose reveals itself and becomes known in human experience. Full understanding of Christ is only possible through the Holy Spirit. The significance of His being given to the disciples is that they will be led into all truth. (Jn. 16,13). The presence of the Holy Spirit among the disciples means the assurance that the believers in Christ will share the revelation of God in Christ till the end of time, when history/

history will be gathered into Eschaton. (The truth and the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel are interchangeable. Both mean that God has revealed Himself in Christ and that this revelation is the centre and meaning of all things, and that this revelation is accessible to man - by its own authentication. Truth authenticates itself. When this is translated into the language of the New Testament revelation it is the same as saying, "The Holy Spirit reveals Christ).

The promise of the Paraclete to the disciples is the final testimony in the teaching of Jesus - that, his own person as the revelation of God therein, as God's encounter with man in 'man's own world' - and that the Person of Jesus the Christ and God's revelation in him stood beyond the vicissitudes of history. Jesus reminds the disciples that the "proof" is simply his promise of the Paraclete which was yet not in the "possession" of the disciples, but, when this was so, the disciples should remember that Jesus promised Him to them while still in the flesh, the obvious meaning of this in the Fourth Gospel, is that Jesus was only able to make this promise because even in his flesh he was the pre-existent Word and Son of God who knew himself as such, for otherwise the promise of the Spirit who later became the actuality of the Church cannot be accounted for, unless he who promises/

promises the Paraclete and realises the promises are one. (Incidentally, in the Acts and the theology of Paul and other New Testament writings, the presence of the Spirit in the Church is ascribed not to any human agency but to the direct action of God).

The significance of the Pneumatology wherein the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the Promise of Christ in the Johannine and Synoptic Gospels is very obvious. This promise is the meeting place of the Gospel and the Church. This statement, however, needs explanation. Prior to the promise of the Spirit, it was through the person of Jesus and the Gospel he preached that God's revelation was present in the world. In the promise of the Holy Spirit two new factors emerge. The Holy Spirit and the Church. Until now the Church has been hidden in the Gospel. The Holy Spirit in the Christ, but from now on it is the Church which reveals the Gospel, and the Holy Spirit who reveals the Christ. These 'four' cannot be separated. The revelation of God is a constellation - Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Gospel and the Church. Where these four are not present, there is no understanding of the revelation. Those who play the Gospel against the Church, the Church against the Gospel, are simply breaking the revelation of God in Christ and playing broken/

broken parts against each other. This is the sin against the Holy Spirit in Whom the revelation of God meets us as the unity of these four, which is an indelible correlation.¹

* * * * *

It remains in this study of the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel to examine two more passages, John 7,39, and 20,22. The first passage, Jn.7,39 has created considerable difficulties to the student of Johannine theology through its incongruity in its context. But even so radical a critic as the late E.F.Scott admits its authenticity, the best proof of which is that it expresses clearly and precisely a characteristic thought of the Gospel. (E.F.Scott: The Fourth Gospel, p.332). This passage is of great importance as it reveals the author's thinking on the bestowal of the gift of the Holy Spirit upon/

1. H.B.Swete (op.cit.p.156) on Jn. 15,26: "The Paraclete..... he will bear witness to me and you also are witnesses, because you have been with me from the beginning". But it will not supercede human testimony or be indistinguishable from it; the Spirit is not a substitute for the labour or the personality of the disciples, but a co-operating force: and ye, too, the Lord adds, bear witness as those who are qualified to speak of ME in virtue of an experience which goes back to the beginning of the ministry".

upon the disciples, which many commentators on the ground of Jn. 20,22 say the Fourth Evangelist associates with the Resurrection. If this is correct then the question arises of the authenticity of the Lukan record in the Acts where the bestowal of the gift is ascribed to the Pentecost. I believe that John 7,39 helps us to understand this problem and so it is best to be studied after that of John 20,22.

In the passage preceding John 20,22 the Fourth Evangelist tells how on the evening of the day of Resurrection the risen Christ came into the midst of the disciples at the secret place where they were gathered. He reveals to them that He was the very same Jesus who was crucified, with the proof of the pierced hands and side. Then He gave them the missionary commission: "And when He had said this He breathed on them and said to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'" (John 20,22).

The light which John 7,39 throws on John 20,22 is not direct. The primary intention of its author was to answer a speculative question which perhaps was discussed in the early Church - why was the Spirit not given during the earthly life of Jesus. "Now", says the Fourth Evangelist, "this He said about the Holy Spirit, which those who believed in Him were to receive for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not glorified". Was, therefore, the Resurrection, the final happening in the/

the life of Jesus the Christ, the event in which the Revelation of God in Him manifested its dénouement, the crowning of which was the gift of the Holy Spirit to those who were the witnesses of the events in Christ's earthly life and believed in Him as the Son of God? The writer of the Acts speaks of the Ascension in preference to the Resurrection as the act of complete glorification, and the receiving of the Holy Spirit he ascribes to the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2, 1-4). The search for the solution of this problem is the search for the unity of the New Testament tradition to which New Testament scholars are at present paying more attention than before. (This particularly struck me in the lectures of Prof. O. Cullmann). Is Johannine tradition at variance with the Lucan on this point? I believe them not to be. I believe that the Gospel of John enhances the teaching of the Acts as the true account of the bestowal of the Spirit. The Fourth Evangelist, while describing the Resurrection (in common with other Evangelists) as the overwhelming proof that Jesus was the son of God, nevertheless records that the risen Christ says to Mary Magdalene: "Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father". (Jn. 20,17).

If/

If the Fourth Evangelist meant to make the receiving of the Holy Spirit at the Resurrection as the final act of Christ's glorification, these words of Christ, expressing something yet 'lacking' in his Divine mission are difficult to understand.

Secondly, if the Resurrection Day is the Day of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples, then Jn. 20,22 stands in contradiction to Jn. 16,7 ff., especially in the words, "If I do not go away the Paraclete will not come to you". The Evangelist in my judgment is not guilty of this contradiction for his intention was not to speak in Jn.20,22 of the bestowal of the Spirit; but this is how he has been understood. If this is so, as I believe it to be, the question arises how ought we to understand Jn.20,22? It should not be understood otherwise than as a promise of the Holy Spirit, of which this Gospel had spoken earlier, with only this difference, that Jesus now strengthens it and gives it the assurance of fulfilment by pointing to the Resurrection as a further proof that He was the way, the truth and the life. (Jn. 14,6). Here He brings the promise of the Holy Spirit so close to the awareness of the disciples that it almost touches them but does not grasp them as yet. This consummation is to belong to the Pentecost. The passage/

passage in Jn. 20,22 does not have the same meaning as the Acts 2.1-4, but as Matthew 28,19, where Christ's commission is declared.

For the full understanding of this commission and the power to carry it through, they had to wait for the experience of the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.

This view is supported also by Eph. 4,8 where the quotation from Ps.68 is used: "When He ascended on high He led a host of captives, and He gave gifts to men".

The resurrection of Jesus carried the overwhelming conviction for the disciples that Jesus was their Lord and God. John 20.29 (Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου) Nevertheless, the disciples were not free from some misunderstanding of their Master, (which is incompatible with the conception of the possession of the Holy Spirit as the full understanding of Jesus the Christ). Luke records that immediately before the Ascension the disciples asked Jesus: "Lord, will you at this time restore the Kingdom of Israel?" Instead of answering this question which was prompted by the Jewish conception of the Messiahship, Jesus speaks of the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples; (Acts 1.6) or to put it in words of P.Lloyd: "At once He warns them that the gift of the Holy Spirit is to raise them up on a higher plane than/

than that on which such questions are asked". (ibid p.22)
 There is nothing in the Gospel of St. John to suggest that the Lucan account in this instance is not genuine New Testament tradition. Those who interpret Jn. 20,22 as the bestowal of the Spirit upon the disciples are not only disrupting the unity of the New Testament tradition, but also that of the Fourth Gospel itself. I do not think that the Fourth Evangelist is guilty of either.

Moreover, the Fourth Evangelist's conception of the Paraclete is very personal and this does not fit into the impersonal picture of the Holy Spirit in Jn.20,22; and it is difficult to see how these two conceptions could be reconciled if Jn.20,22 is meant to be the fulfilment of the Promise of the Paraclete. As has been said, the Fourth Gospel was written to correct any misunderstanding of the Gospel tradition.* The Fourth Gospel had no reason to offer any corrective to the Acts in which the Pentecost is described as the fulfilment of the Promise of the Paraclete. If he had, he would have made more than a passing reference to the Holy Spirit. In Jn.20,22. The highest meaning one could ascribe to the action of Jesus/

* During my studies under Prof. Cullman, I discussed with him the view expressed in the last part of the sentence, to which he gave his assent.

Jesus in Jn.20,22 by breathing on the disciples and saying, 'Receive the Holy Spirit', is to remind them of His promise concerning the Holy Spirit, and also to remind them of the identity of the Holy Spirit and Himself, so that they might not think that the otherness of the Holy Spirit, of which he told them prior to His sufferings, was such that they would have to deal with someone so separated from Jesus that in him Jesus will be no more recognisable. This last statement is implied in the fact that this Gospel constantly speaks of the Unity of the Father and the Son and expresses also the Unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. This is the meaning of the words of Jesus: 'The Father will give you another Paraclete to abide with you for ever' (Jn. 14,16), which is immediately followed by a statement, 'I will not leave you I will come to you'. (Jn. 14,18).

Here at the end in this study of Johannine pneumatology, I propose to make some short comments on the pneumatological views of Jacobus Faber (1455-1536): Watkins Jones, *ibid*, p.238, and of the Dutch mystic, Jan van Ruysbroek: (Watkins Jones, *op.cit*.p.219). The relevance of this study lies in the fact that in the views of Faber and of Ruysbroek there is a certain degree of misunderstanding which is sometimes found in more recent studies of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

In/

In a passage from Faber we read: "As long as the Lord was plainly present in the world, the Holy Spirit (although He is the Spirit of truth, that is of the Son) was with the Father, and absent from the world but after the Lord was received up to the Father and was plainly absent from the world, He sent Him from the Father". In answer to Faber it must be said that the Holy Spirit was also present in the world in Jesus the Christ, but was confined only to the Christ. If the Holy Spirit was not present in the world in Christ, the disciples could not receive Him afterwards for, in the words of the Fourth Evangelist, they could not know him. (Jn. 14,17). His coming upon the disciples would not have been their receiving Him, but the violation of their human freedom, in relation to God, which is not the way of the working of the Holy Spirit. Faber is right, however, when he says that the disciples did not receive Him, as long as Christ was in the world.

The passage in which Ruysbroek expresses his view is more interesting and therefore needs to be quoted at length: "It must likewise be understood that Christ gave the Holy Spirit to His disciples at three stages and for three reasons. He gave Him to them before He suffered, when He bestowed upon them the power of working miracles -/

miracles - of healing the sick, of expelling demons, of raising the dead, - all of which were but physical operations, (*corporalia opera*), since they themselves were following Christ at that time with love, which was in some measure tangible, physical or fleshly. Again, He gave Him to them after He had risen from the dead in order that through Him they might accomplish spiritual actions and works, namely that they might baptise, remit sins and teach the truth; in as much as their spiritual love was already surpassing and overcoming their physical or fleshly love. Thirdly, He gave Him to them at the last, when He had ascended into Heaven, in order that through Him they might achieve Divine works and be one with God." The three moments of the giving of the Holy Spirit by Christ to the disciples, of which Ruysbroek speaks, should be understood as three degrees in the consciousness and experience of the disciples through which they were led to acknowledge their Master as the Son of God. The Holy Spirit was not received in degrees. He was received as the culmination of their acknowledgment of Christ as God's Revelation in a final and unique sense. The Holy Spirit was given to them as the seal of this revelation. And this was the Pentecost. Prior to the Pentecost the Holy Spirit was with the disciples but not in them. (Jn. 14,17) (Because He was upon Jesus, who was with/

with his disciples). The view of Ruysbroek is very interesting from the standpoint of the Christian spiritual life in which the presence of the Holy Spirit is determined by the degree of the individual's acknowledgment of Christ. But this is the situation of the post-Pentecostal Christians for whom Christ and the Spirit are one. For the disciples of Jesus this was not so until the Pentecost. Here John 7.39 is most helpful and must be stressed as one of the key passages of the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A.

Here we quote some authors who have commented on John 20.22 whose comments reveal the difficulty implicit in this verse, and also how this difficulty has been met. Thus, H.B. Swete, (op. cit. p.166) says: "Here are two things to be noted:- (1) it is not the Person of the Paraclete Spirit but the Inspiration of His life which is communicated; and (2) the use of labete rather than deheste implies that the gift is not opus operatum, but a vital force which must be met by personal effort and not received passively".

Maldonatus, a Roman Catholic theologian of the Counter-Reformation, (H. Watkins Johnes op.cit. p.310 ff): "Christ had stated beforehand that if He Himself did not depart, the Holy Spirit would not come visibly and with all His gifts; and this is true to the fact, for He did not come in this manner before the day of Pentecost. At this point, before he departed, He gave Him to the Apostles, though with a visible sign yet invisibly, because when He sent them forth into the whole world, it was necessary with some provision for their journey".

W. Clark, (op. cit. p.96) says: "It must be regarded not merely as an anticipation of the Gift of the Pentecost, but as special endowment of the Apostles qualifying them for their work".

G.W.H. Lampe: ("Baptism in the New Testament: p.168 S.J.T., June 1952): "The statement of the Fourth Gospel that the Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified, is implicit in all the records. Indeed His baptism, (baptism of Jesus - insertion mine), was proleptic of the promise of the Holy Spirit after the Ascension".

Philip Lloyd, (ibid p.30), interprets John 20.22 as the giving of authority to the disciples. While Pentecost for him is the gift of power; "therefore the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was required in order that the Power might be available in the Church for the Apostles to exercise it by virtue of their special commission"..... "So at the Pentecost we see the Holy Spirit descending upon the whole body of believers, in order to make them one body, the living body of Christ, the body in which He was to live and through which He was to work..... On Easter Day the Lord Jesus had already chosen/

chosen some members of that Body to be the instruments through whom He would perform certain functions of that body". The view of Bishop Lloyd is more relevant to the problem of the authority of the Apostolic Ministry in the Church, which cannot be discussed here. But *mutatis mutandis*, Lloyd suggests that the meaning of the Pentecost is the creation of the Church as the instrument of the Apostolic authority to which he subordinates the Church. Lloyd's view destroys completely the conception of the Church as an organism, for 'the church' and 'apostolic authority' oppose each other. Since this problem is discussed by Lloyd on the biblical grounds of John 20,22 and Acts 2, 1 ff., it must be said that what these passages really suggest is that the Apostolic authority is not opposed to the church as some interpret into the meaning of the Easter Commission, but arise from within the Christian fellowship as the Pentecost suggests. The Easter commission is the promise of such a church and the Pentecost is its realisation. In this sense the Pentecost does not minimise the Apostolic authority and ministry, but it incorporates it in the Church. Thus it is saved from an understanding of itself as the power of overlordship which demonises every authority. The fact that the Apostolic ministry and the Church are interdependent gives the understanding of the Apostolic ministry as the authority which springs from and whose meaning lies in the service of Christian fellowship. (The washing of the feet of the disciples by Christ is the interpretation of the Apostolic ministry as service). It is the authority of Love. The Apostolic ministry is only meaningful when it is the revelation of the authority of God's love. Thus the Apostolic ministry and authority reveal the Holy Spirit as their meaning, and as the Lord of the Church in whom the Lordship of Christ in the Church is present.

* * * * *

APPENDIX B.

The Meaning of the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel.

Although the Fourth Gospel does not mention the institution of the Eucharist, it presupposes it and tries to explain the meaning and importance of the Eucharistic "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man" (Jn. 6.53); and also the meaning of Jesus' eucharistic saying, "I am the bread of life". (Jn. 6.48 ff.)

For the Fourth Evangelist since eating and drinking are the means through which the human organism participates in physical life, so also the Eucharistic eating and drinking are a means whereby the believer participates in the life of the Spirit. Participation in the Spirit is only possible through Christ, through whom alone it is available and in whom it is fully present to man. The Spirit is to be found nowhere else. The Spirit expresses Himself in Christ's words which the Fourth Evangelist describes as the Spirit and the life (Jn. 6.63). But the believer's participation in Christ goes far beyond the mere knowledge that Christ is the source of his life as a spiritual being. That is why Christ does not only give Himself in His word but eucharistically as well. Through the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine in the Eucharist, by faith in Christ as the Son of God, the Holy Spirit, (who inspires this faith by revealing Christ, by abiding on Him), makes the Eucharistic bread and wine Christ's flesh and blood by which is meant that the very life of Christ is communicated to the believer to be his own. The Fourth Evangelist points at the stumbling block of this teaching for a man who does not understand the full revelation of God in Christ. That is why the Fourth Evangelist adds by way of comment that the words of Christ (Jn. 6.51 ff) should be understood not in the physical but in the spiritual sense. Hence his injunction: "It is the Spirit that giveth life, the flesh is of no avail" (Jn. 6.63). In other words the Fourth Evangelist is saying - it is not scandalous of Christ to speak of himself as one whose flesh is to be eaten and blood drunk because of the Holy Spirit who abides uniquely on/

on Him. Unless man partakes in Christ in this way he has no share in the Spirit. The Eucharistic teaching in the Fourth Gospel is intelligible only in the light of the pneumatological teaching of the Gospel.

* * * * *

THE PERSONALITY OF THE PARACLETE IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

This problem should not be discussed without reference to the Pneumatology of the New Testament as a whole. There are reasons, however, for *studying* this problem separately in relation to the Fourth Gospel, because all students of the New Testament for whom the Holy Spirit is an impersonal category, concentrate their attacks upon the Pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel because of the personal nature of the language used in this Gospel when referring to the Holy Spirit.

Professor W. Clark, commenting upon the personality of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel says: "No words could express more clearly the personality of the subject concerning whom the testimony is given.....

If such language does not signify the personality of the subject no language could certainly do so". Ibid.p.23

E.F.Scott, however, while admitting this, says: "Granting therefore that much of this language may easily bear a personal interpretation, we are not to infer that John regarded the Spirit as a personality.1... the Spirit is an influence imparted through Christ to those who believe in Him - His own Divine breath moving for ever in His Church and quickening it with a new life". (Fourth Gospel, p.342 ff.)

Let/

Let us for a moment put aside the argument on the personality of the Paraclete from our discussion of the personal language the Fourth Evangelist uses for the Paraclete. The use of personification to portray concepts is common in the Bible. (There is no reason to think that the Fourth Gospel is an exception to this practice).

The reader of the Fourth Gospel is struck by the inner certainty of Jesus that from the depths of God another Divine self was constantly upholding Him. In the Paraclete, He knew God not as a cosmic force, (as would have been the case had the Paraclete been an impersonal force), but as the Father. Jesus, the Christ, promised to the disciples precisely this Divine Presence, the Paraclete, in whom God was transparent to Him and He to God. It is impossible to conceive this transparency of which we speak, as other than an act of Communion - (fellowship) between Jesus and the Divine Self who dwelt in Him, and whom the New Testament calls the Holy Spirit and who revealed to Christ Christ's own selfhood and that of the Father. The Holy Spirit comprehended Christ in such a way that Christ experienced Him as His deepest self. From this springs Jesus' own consciousness of possessing the Holy Spirit. It is only possible to understand the Christ of the Fourth/

Fourth Gospel, and indeed Jesus the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels, as one who spoke about himself and the future of His disciples guided by the Holy Spirit only from an experience I have referred to above. Other than in this way those who see and acknowledge the Revelation of God in him are at a loss how to explain this revelation as a living faith and not as a mere set of theological propositions.

When E.F.Scott dismisses the whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel and says: "All that is vital in it is contained already in the grand conception of the return of Christ as an invisible and abiding presence," (op. cit. p.347), how does E.F.Scott account for the invisible presence of Christ, one may ask? The very possibility of it is incomprehensible from the New Testament standpoint unless the Holy Spirit who, in the earthly life of Jesus abode on him, later rested upon the disciples of Jesus. Without some such conception of the Holy Spirit, the Johannine Gospel and indeed the whole New Testament is not a revelation - the living encounter with God in Christ. That the Paraclete of the Fourth Gospel meets us as a personal Divine Self in whom the witness to Christ as the Divine Son of God and Christ's own presence are revealed, /

revealed, explains the appeal of this Gospel to the deepest Christian spirituality despite so much criticism of this Gospel by New Testament scholars in the past. This is responsible for the name Spiritual (pneumatics) Gospel ascribed to the Fourth Gospel by Clement of Alexandria. (vide Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History: Bk. VI, Ch. 14).

We will not pursue our argument on this point further here as we propose to discuss the personality of the Spirit further on in our study. One thing may however be added. The invisible and purely spiritual character of the Paraclete does not preclude us from asserting his personality, for, as H.B. Swete points out: "It is in that which is most spiritual in us that we find evidence of our personal life. That he (the Paraclete) fulfils the whole of our Lord's personal functions towards the Church, that He belongs to the category of Paraclete - Teacher, Director, Protector, Counsellor, - this investigates Him with all the essential attributes of that which we understand by personality". (Op. cit. p. 292)¹.

1. Buchsel (op. cit. p. 503 ff.) discussing the personality of the Johannine Paraclete says: "Der Geist ist Person nicht Kraft... schon die Bezeichnung paraklitos widerspricht der Kraftvorstellung ... Der Geist ist persönlich gedacht. Persönlich ist auch sein Verhältniss zur Wahrheit bezw zu Gott gedacht Persönlich ist auch sein Verhältniss/

Notes: Contd:

Verhältnis zur Wahrheit bezw zu Gott gedacht...Personlich ist auch sein Verhältniss zu Jesus. Demgemass ist nun auch die Wirkung des Geistes in der Jungerschaft. Der Geist wirkt als Person auf Personen.... Mit der Macht der Wahrheit wirkt er auf den Menschen nicht mit der Macht einer Naturkraft..... Der Pneumatiker hat eine Überzeugung, Wahrheitsbesitz nicht nur einen dunkeln, unklaren Antrieb." Underlinings mine.

It has already been said that the meaning of the word Paraclete cannot be exhausted by any single term. Here it is proposed to mention a few more terms suggested as additions to those already mentioned in the course of this study. In Latin we find the word Confortator, (Strengtheners), (Clark op.cit.p), also Advocatus; (Buchsel op.cit.p.498); Der Beistand (E.Schweizer, Reformatio p.209) and der Fursprecher, (one who speaks on someone's behalf in the situation of need. In former times this was usually a friend). The American R.V. translates it as Counsellor. Buchsel criticises this rendering. He says it was due to Zahn, followed by W. Bauer, who interpreted Paraclete in Philo in this way. Buchsel says that Philo never means with Paraclete Der Ratgeber or Der Lehrmeister, (the Counsellor or Teacher) but der Fursprecher. As regards the rendering of the Paraclete as Consolator, (English: comforter; German: Troster), Buchsel says: "Ein Beweis für das Recht der Übersetzung consolator und der ihr entsprechenden Erklärung ist aus dem allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch nicht erbracht Das man später aus dem Anwalt und Fursprecher den Troster und Lehrer machte, ist nur verständlich". ibid p.499.

* * * * *

3. STUDIES IN THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
IN ACTS, THE PAULINE EPISTLES AND OTHER
NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.
(THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH).

Introduction:

Now we come to the third part of our studies in the Pneumatology of the New Testament.

The grouping of New Testament writings, other than the Gospels, is somewhat arbitrary, since different writers approach the teaching about the Holy Spirit from the particular angle which their theme of the divine revelation in Christ imposes upon them. The only justification for grouping them together is that their Pneumatology is based on a common experience of the Holy Spirit having grasped the Christian community. He has come - he is no more the promise but the abiding reality of the Church. Although Christians live in the world and the flesh, their life is no more conditioned by the flesh in an absolute sense, but by the Spirit. (Rom. 8:4). It is with this thought in the background that we understand the description of the Christian community in this world as the colony of heaven (Philip. 3:20). (So Moffatt translate the Greek *κοινωνία*).

We/

We lose the key to an understanding of the Church or the Holy Spirit unless we comprehend the inter-relation of the Holy Spirit and the Church. Russian Eastern Orthodox theologian, Sergius Bulgakov, rightly calls the third part of his Dogmatics, which is solely concerned with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, "The Studies concerning Divine Humanity".

This inter-relation of the Holy Spirit and the Church can endanger the understanding of the Holy Spirit. F.C.Synge describes this situation most aptly when he says: "We find difficulty in thinking of the Holy Spirit as fully personal. The cause of this difficulty, and the effect of it, is that we have attached Him too closely to the Church, we have as it were welded Him to the Church, so that He has not the freedom either of one who is personal or one who is God. We think of Him as a sort of funnel through which God pours out grace, and the funnel is firmly secured in place at our end!"

(S.J.Th. March 1953 p.70). The same view is present in the thought of J.E.Fison, "The Blessing of the Holy Spirit", p.173 - "The Holy Spirit is plus, beyond Bible, sacrament, Church, ministry and human reason and experience and yet not to be sharply contrasted with any or all of these and other means of grace".^{1.}

1. Vol.Ibid p.71/72.

My criticism of G.W.H.Lampe's book "The Seal of the Spirit", is that his Pneumatology is on the one hand swallowed by Christology and on the other by Ecclesiology so that it tends to disappear altogether, except as a doctrine subservient to Christology and Ecclesiology. This subservience is right, provided Christology and Ecclesiology are in turn made subservient to Pneumatology, but this is not the impression his book left on me. A quotation from Lampe may illustrate what I mean - "If we are in Christ, we are in the Spirit, or the Spirit in us, we are in the organ of Christ's continuing earthly activity the Church and our sins are forgiven". (Ibid p.58)

At this stage it seems to be of the highest importance to clear some misunderstandings concerning the meaning of the Church. In this thesis wherever the term Church is used, it denotes the community of the followers of Christ grasped and welded into one living organism by the Holy Spirit, in whom their common purpose is revealed as the instruments of Christ in whom God had manifested Himself and revealed the meaning of human existence and history. This organism asserts neither the supremacy of the individual over the collective, nor the collective over the individual, but stands for fellowship where the individual lives for the community and the community for the individual. Through this fellowship an individual/

individual is transformed into a person. The term person here simply means a human being who finds the meaning of his existence in the fellowship with others and for whom this meaning is not a theoretical possibility but the existential reality. Also this fellowship transforms the collective into the community. There is no life in the Holy Spirit for the individual without it being related to the community. The community, however, draws its meaning from the worship and service of God through Christ in the Power of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit inspires and assists both the worship and the service of the Christian community, acting upon its members individually so that their individuality, with all its gifts, is not diminished for the sake of a mechanical uniformity. Rather the unity of the believers (which is the same as to say the unity of the Church) is created by the sharing in the Holy Spirit. Through the Holy Spirit believers experience their unity in Christ as the head of the Church, and give this unity an organisation in accordance with its inner spiritual structure, its social necessity and its primitive Apostolic character.^{1.}

1. The word Ecclesia - The Church, which comes from Greek ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ call out together, - should be interpreted to mean calling out to participate with others in worship, where God who is worshipped and those who worship Him are united with Him and with each other. Thus the ecclesia is a calling out of man from his loneliness and separation. The Church is the reunion of man with his

Notes: Contd.

his fellows in God who reveals His own reunion with man in Christ. The reality of this reunion is the Holy Spirit. F.J.A.Hart is right when he says: "There is no foundation for the widely spread notion that EKKLESIA means a people or a number of individual men called out of the world of mankind". V. The Christian Ecclesia p.5.

"Having regard to its etymology we should prefer to say 'Church' which is derived from *KŪPIOS* and means "belonging to the Lord". But the word has so many meanings that it will not do by itself. Perhaps the 'Assembly of God' might be called the 'Church community'. Karl Ludwig Schmidt: "The Church". (Bible key words from G. Kittel's T.W.2 NT).

* * * * *

The New Testament never opposes individual to the Church or the Church to the individual. This idea is foreign to the New Testament. Whenever in the history of Christianity this has happened, those who have championed either of these two, one against the other, have not only misinterpreted the meaning of the conception they denounced but also the one they tried to vindicate. The following example from Irving Wood will illustrate what I mean: "The Church as the repository of the Spirit is a Greek notion, which rests on Platonic idealism and finds no sanction in Paul's theology. He knows of no spirit-filled substance called the Church, but only of spirit-filled persons who together make the Church".¹ It is obvious that in a discussion like this we are not in the sphere of New Testament theology but in a vicious circle of Mediaeval philosophical controversy between realists and nominalists. What I. Wood forgets, however, by interpreting the Church from the standpoint of the individual, is that persons, even those who are spirit-filled, do not make up the Church. The very fact that they are filled with the Spirit shows that they are already in the Church and that they are the Church.

1. Irving Wood: "The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature," p. 204. London 1904.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES:

The Pentecost:

The book of Acts reminds its readers at the beginning that it is the continuation of the Gospel record on the revelation of God in Christ. Before speaking of its central event, the Pentecost, the book of Acts explains that the understanding of the Pentecost lies in the promise of the Holy Spirit by Jesus (Acts 1.), and thus links the Pneumatology of the Gospels and Acts by their interpretation of each other.

The fulfilment of the promise of the Holy Spirit of which the Gospels speak is described in the book of Acts Ch.2.1 ff. The story of Pentecost is so well known that it hardly needs to be repeated here. One thing becomes clear without any doubt, that for the primitive Christian community (Urgemeinde) God who has spoken in the world in the person of Jesus, the Christ, (after his physical presence has been taken away "into the glory of God", as one who stands at the right hand of God as Stephen saw Him in his vision, Acts 7.56) has again spoken by the same Christ through the Holy Spirit, who henceforth reveals Christ to the community of Christ's followers as the ever-present reality in whom God sums up all things. It was for this purpose that the Holy Spirit/

Spirit was given, as an abiding, inspiring and guiding Divine Self, in whom the Lordship of Christ is known among the Christian believers.^{2.}

The disciples of Jesus who after the Pentecostal experience became his Apostles (Ambassadors) were convinced that they were grasped by the power of the Holy Spirit, through whose agency they felt themselves living at the end of time.^{3.} This is seen from the apostolic interpretation of the meaning of the Pentecost in terms of the prophecy of Joel (Joel 2:28-32). In the coming of the Holy Spirit the original Christian community saw the final victory of Christ over the whole of/

2. "The distribution of the sacred fire evidently pointed to the truth that the Paraclete had come to dwell not only with the society as a whole, nor with the officers of the society, but with all its members." H.B.Swete, *ibid* p.72.

3. "Up to that time the followers of Jesus were called disciples; but by the power of the Holy Spirit these separate individuals were made to be organised whole, a living body, in which every member had its own place and function, contributing to the completeness and harmony of the whole - all the members depending upon the Head, all being members one of another. All this was done by the power of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, and this is, therefore, the Birthday of the Church".
v. W. Clark, "The Comforter" p. 101.

In connection with designation of Pentecost as 'The Birthday of the Church' it may be said that if there is justification for using typology in relation to Jesus the Christ and the Church, then the Pentecost corresponds most aptly to the Baptism of Jesus and for this reason Pentecost may well be described as The Baptism of the Church.

of history (Acts 2:29 ff). To share in this victory and escape the judgment thereof, Peter advises his hearers to repent, and to be baptised in the name of Jesus, for in baptism the believer receives the Holy Spirit, who makes him partaker of Christ. (Acts 2:38).

The Pentecostal experience of the Primitive Church raises the problem of the prophetic nature of the Church, which demands from a Christian theologian to explain its full implications for the Church and show its existential meaning to the Church. S. Bulgakov has this to say on this problem: "The gift of prophecy as a Pentecostal gift means that the Christian man makes history through prophetic inspiration and is responsible for it. According to this interpretation, Pentecost is the universal consecration to prophesy for which everyone receives his special gift in the Sacrament of Confirmation - "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit" - and in this sense no one in the Church is deprived of the gracious gift."¹.

-
1. S. Bulgakov: "The Spirit of Prophecy" (an article in "Sobornost" September, 1939 p.5. Bulgakov most aptly describes the prophetic character of Christian faith when he says: "Prophecy means therefore the general Spirit-bearing quality of Christian humanity after Pentecost, capable in its human inspiration as creatures to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and be inspired by it. Human inspiration thus becomes divinely human". (ibid).

The quotation from Bulgakov where he speaks of the prophetic gift as the way by which Christian man creates history and is responsible for it, seems to me a more penetrating analysis of Christian Anthropology than that of Fredrick Gogarten, who is also concerned with the same problem/

Notes: Contd.

problem. (v. "Demythologizing and History" p.48 ff). Bulgakov's and Gogarten's views should be considered complementary rather than contradictory, for they both speak about the same reality, approaching it from different angles.

* * * * *

Pentecost is the fulfilment of Israel's prophetic hope concerning the coming of the Spirit upon all flesh and also signifies the parting of the "Israel after the flesh" from the "Israel after the Spirit". Pentecost is the revelation of the poverty of "Israel after the flesh" and also the revelation of the nature of the "Israel after the Spirit" - The Christian Church. Dom Gregory Dix expresses these two situations thus:

"The Spirit of the Lord" spoke to Israel "by the Prophets"; but "the Spirit" did not "possess" Israel itself. The "Spirit of the Lord" had been offered to Israel as a whole in all His princely fulness in The Messiah, and Israel had rejected "The Messiah". "Acceptance" of that Messiah, and self-identification with Him is the very root of the Christian Church's being, as it is the very root of the Christian's being in Baptism; and in Him is the fulness of the Prophetic Spirit. If the idea of the Church as The Mystical Body of Christ means anything at all, it must mean that the Church as such is "Messianic" herself, redeeming and revealing. And if the idea of the Church as "Spirit-bearing" (which/

(which follows from it) means anything, it must mean that the Church as such is "Prophetic" herself, accepting and apprehending and applying that redemption and revelation".¹

There has been a tendency to treat the Pentecost story as a Legendary. (v. R. Eultmann "The Theology of N.T." p. 41) Edward Schweizer however opposes this view most vigorously. In his essay "Geist und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament und heute" (ibid p.5) he says: "It seems to me attested historically that the community in some form has experienced the outpouring of the Spirit". He asks how otherwise one could account for the change from/

1. Sobornost, December 1939, p.5.

v. Also F. Buchsel (ibid p.264) "Jesus hat den Geist unmittelbar von Gott. Die Gemeinde hat ihn von Gott kraft ihrer Verbundenheit mit Jesus. Fur die Gemeinde sind deshalb das Evangelium von Jesus und die Taufe im Namen Jesu die Vermittler des Geistes, Jesus erhielt den Geist zwar durch den Tauffer, aber nicht im Namen des Taufers. Die Urgemeinde steht Jesus an der Seite, sofern sie den Geist, denn er hatte auch zu haben gewiss ist, sie bleibt aber Jesus untergeordnet, sofern sie den Geist nur durch ihn empfängt".

W. Clark (ibid. p. 132): "Just as the teaching of our Lord during His earthly ministry was not independent of the anointing of the Divine Spirit, so the teaching of the Paraclete after the Day of Pentecost was not separate from or independent of the teaching of the Lord Jesus".

from the losing of hope which drove the disciples into flight as far as Galilee, to the strength to settle in Jerusalem for the testimony in order to build up an even bigger community. Would such a community be organised in Jerusalem in its midst if there was no experience of the Spirit, and was not this the occurrence of that which the Jews expected before the end of time - the outpouring of the Spirit over all? Schweizer also answers those critics who see in the Pentecost story only an afterthought of the Hellenistic community without any historic grounding and he asks whether such a community would be anxious to write any Pentecost history and produce Scriptural proofs (Acts 2:16-21) to support its significance? The arguments of Schweizer seem to me conclusive in face of the facts which he brings out.

* * * * *

The Holy Spirit and Christian Missionary Work.

The Pneumatology of the Acts must be studied from the point of view of the mission of the Primitive Church, for the Pneumatology of Acts is interwoven in the missionary enterprise of the Church, the story of which the author of Acts is anxious to record. The gift of the Holy Spirit, for the writer of Acts, is the key to the understanding/

understanding of the mission and expansion of the Church. For him the Church has been constituted by the Holy Spirit, by His descent on its hundred and twenty members at Pentecost. By the Holy Spirit also the Church exists and all its activities as such are not a merely human enterprise, but are of the Holy Spirit, working through the men and women who have received Him, continually increasing the fellowship of the believers, cementing through Himself its inner unity in Christ and building it up as one organism in relation to another, making Himself their common bond in Christ. (Acts 5:32)¹.

The boldness of Peter, in his witness to Christ before "the rulers, scribes and the high priest" is ascribed to the "filling by the Holy Spirit", (Acts 4:8); so also is Stephen's testimony (Acts 7:55). The same is the case with the testimony of the Christian community in Jerusalem, after the release of Peter and John, who had been commanded by the Jewish authorities not to continue the preaching of the Gospel. As the community was gathered at prayer it experienced anew the assurance of the presence of the Holy Spirit, and afterwards "spoke the word of God with boldness" (Acts 4:23-31).

-
1. "Notice that the Holy Spirit was not received only by the Apostles, but also by their converts. Acts 10:44-6; 19,6; in accordance with the word of Christ. Mk. 16:17".

Mitropolit Anthony. Uchenie Tzerkvi o Svyatom Duhye (Russian).

The spreading of Christianity in Samaria and the admission of the Samaritans into the Christian community by baptism is accompanied by the receiving of the Holy Spirit through the Apostolic prayer and the laying on of hands - thus revealing to the new converts the meaning and reality of their new faith (Acts 8:14). The receiving of the Holy Spirit in this instance seems to have carried unmistakable self evidence, as the magician Simon was most anxious to buy the secret of this power, which he understood in terms of his own craft, as a magic manipulated by man. His rebuke by Peter, that his blindness to understand what is really involved here proves him a wicked man, and that only the prayer to the Lord (Christ) may save him (Acts 8:18 ff)¹.

-
1. On this point we touch upon the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of which the Gospels speak. Our contention that the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is constituted by the fact of not seeing Him revealed by Jesus, which conversely means not recognising the manifestation of the Holy Spirit as the presence of Christ Himself, and consequently acknowledging Him as the Lord, is enhanced by this passage.

Holy Spirit, the Guide in Missionary Work.

The Holy Spirit is portrayed in Acts as the guide of the Church in missionary enterprise. This is most realistically illustrated by the instances in the life of St. Paul. He and Barnabas are set apart by the Christian community in Antioch to be the missionaries by the command of the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:2). Their consequent embarking upon the missionary work is described by the writer as being sent by the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:4). Paul is forbidden by the Spirit to preach through the region of Phrygia and Galatia (Acts 16:6), and when Paul and his companions attempted to go to Bithynia, the Spirit of Jesus did not allow them (Acts 16:3), for the Holy Spirit meant them to go to Macedonia, as this was Paul's interpretation, when he and his company embarked to Greece (Acts 16: 8 ff).

Paul accepts to go to Jerusalem in spite of the fact that he knows that it is dangerous for him to do so; but he must obey the Spirit by whom he is in bond as the Ambassador of Christ (Acts 20:22). Peter is compelled by the Spirit to accept the Gentiles into the Christian fellowship without demanding from them acceptance of the Mosaic Law (Acts 11:12), although he shared the opinions of the Judastic party in the Church and would render himself unpopular.

How the guidance of the Holy Spirit was taken as a factor of paramount importance for planning all actions of the Church is seen by the fact that claims by individual members of the community of acting in the particular way under the guidance of the Holy Spirit were taken into serious consideration and the whole policy of the Church was directed in this way if the genuineness of the claim was established; the opposition dared not contradict the Holy Spirit. The classic example of this is the resolution of the Jerusalem Assembly, which decided to admit the Gentiles into the Christian fellowship, not to demand from them the observance of Jewish ordinances. The manifesto describes the reason for this decision: "For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden...etc". (Acts 15:28). The well being of the Church is the comfort of the Holy Spirit (Acts 9:31). (F.J.A.Hort in "The Christian Ecclesia", p.55, translates the word paraklesis as "invocation" explaining that this probably was invoking His guidance as Paraclete to the Ecclesia).

The Holy Spirit and the Members of the Church.

The members of the Church are full of the Holy Spirit - (Acts 6:3 cf. 11:24). Christians receive the Holy Spirit by baptism in the Name of Jesus and by laying on of hands upon those who are baptised. (Acts 19:5 ff). The leaders of the Church are not self-imposing, but the guardians of the flock called to their office by the Holy Spirit to whom they are responsible to/

to feed the Church of God (Acts 20:28). Not only does the service of pastoral ministry imply the responsibility to the Holy Spirit, on the part of those who are committed to it, but also every action of a Christian is judged by the fidelity or infidelity to the Holy Spirit by whom he participates in Christ. Thus the hiding of the amount of money by Ananias and Sapphira which they promised freely to the Church is spoken of as a lie against the Holy Spirit. This sin is dreadful for it makes those who commit it guilty of acquiescing to the promptings of the Holy Spirit (i.e. professing the Lordship of Christ) with part of their being and denying Him with the rest (Acts 5:1): such an act is tempting the Spirit of the Lord (Acts 5:9). This declaration on man's part of Godlikeness in him, which the Holy Spirit creates in unity with human freedom, which receives Him into itself, is being existentially falsified. This creates what some modern existentialists call "bad faith" (Sartre). This is man's assault on the unity of his personality which the Holy Spirit tries to safeguard. Action like that of Ananias and Sapphira denies the truth of Christian faith, namely the unity of word and deed, action and life, the Christ and the Holy Spirit. In the Christian fellowship in which the Holy Spirit abides, there is no place for behaviour like this. In this clothing of the non-being by what appears the true being, Christian agapē becomes reviled. The presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church which creates saintliness in the life of Christian believers, enables them also to recognise His

His absence in those who have claimed Him falsely.

(This signifies the presence of eschaton in the World).

The Prophets in the Church.

St. Paul's warning (Thess.5:19 ff), "Do not quench the Spirit, do not despise prophesying", reveals the importance of the Prophets in the Church. We read in Acts 11:27 ff. about Prophets coming down from Jerusalem. One of them, Agabus, foretold the famine and immediately the action was taken by the Christian community to meet this new situation by organising relief, as they saw in this intimation of the Holy Spirit to the Church. Paul's words concerning his own fate in Jerusalem: "The Holy Spirit testifies to me in every city that imprisonment and afflictions await me" (Acts 20:23) is the intimation by the Prophets. So is most probably Acts 13:2. The Prophets were utterly convinced that they were spokesmen of the Holy Spirit. The Prophet who came from Judea (Agabus), who foretold Paul's imprisonment in Jerusalem, speaks of his prophecy with the finality of conviction: "Thus says the Holy Spirit etc." (Acts 21:11).

The significance of the prophets in the primitive Church has been variously interpreted, thus e.g. H.B.Swete op.cit.p.377: "The Prophets seem to have been in fact to a great extent the teaching ministry of the Primitive Church, and to have acquired before the end of the century an influence which overshadowed that of bishops and deacons".
In/

In this connection Bishop Philip Lloyd makes a very interesting suggestion about the deacons in Acts Ch.6. "They are often called deacons," he says, "but the name is not given to them in Acts and indeed nowhere in the book." (Ibid p.62). He goes on to say that here we have to deal with the prophets who had such pre-eminence in the Church (e.g. I.Cor. 12:28; Eph.2:20; Eph. 3:4-5; cf. Rev. 18:20, 19:10). Commenting upon (I Thess. 2:14-16) "Who both killed the Lord Jesus and the Prophets and drove us out," he asks the question, "Who were those prophets?" and answers: "Clearly the first of them is St. Stephen, and now in Philip the Evangelist, who was also one of the seven, we have another of them...." (Ibid p.77). And again: "Such a prophet is Philip who, now that St. Stephen is dead, is apparently reckoned as chief amongst the seven." (Ibid p.78). Is Lloyd right in his suggestion and is the meaning of Acts 6:3, where for the office of deacon are required men "full of the Spirit and of wisdom," simply a formal recognition of the prophetic office by the Church by the act of ordination? This would help us to solve the problem of whether the prophet in the Church was a charismatic whose gift was sufficient without any formal acknowledgment in the Church to make him occupy a position in the Church. Or was he also ordained to whatever position he might hold in the Church/

Church, e.g. being an evangelist like Philip (Acts 8:4 ff)?

It seems to me that the latter was most probably the case, and that in Acts 6 we have a record of this kind preserved for us. I think the theory of Bishop Lloyd should be further examined. It is probable also that many offices of the Church evolved from the prophetic office such as presbyters, deacons, Evangelists and teachers. Originally there were most probably only two offices - that of Apostles and prophets. The problem whether prophets were in some way ordained by the Church or not, would help us to understand the teaching of the Didache where it is said that the prophets ought to be allowed to give thanks as much as they wish at the service of the Eucharist (Ch.10), which means also that the prophets presided at the Eucharistic services.

The appearance of the prophets in the Christian congregations, and awareness on the part of the believers of the immediate experience of being grasped by the Holy Spirit, leaves no doubt that the Christian community knew itself as belonging to the eschaton. This eschatological self-awareness explains why the Acts of the Apostles presents the mission of the Church with such a sense of urgency. The Acts of the Apostles has rightly been called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit (p.Lloyd ibid p.7)

for/

for this New Testament book interprets both the Church and its mission as the instrument through which God both continues to create history and stops its process by presenting to it his revelation in Christ, in which the testimony to the Lordship of Christ over history is disclosed as the inner meaning of history. This testimony is realised by the presence of the Holy Spirit in history, because of His presence in the Church. Without the Holy Spirit both the Church and history would have lost the memory of their self-identification. In fact there would be neither Church nor history in our understanding of these two terms. That is why history as a science flourishes in the Christian world. The Graeco-Roman world had no philosophy of history, which is responsible for the study of history as a science. Graeco-Roman history was vitiated by the myths which were a human contrivance to impose the meaning on history from within itself, substituting cosmic ideas for the Divine revelation. Hence the cyclic view of history and the idea of fate. The Acts of the Apostles with its Pneumatology presents both the Church and history as created by the Holy Spirit, whose presence in the Church is their inner content. At the same time He, the Holy Spirit, is their negation, for He is drawing them to their end in order to reveal their meaning both for God and human existence. In the Holy Spirit/

Spirit the eschaton is always present and is always at the breaking point, and everything in history is revealed as meaningless which does not participate in Christ, (or as the Bible calls it, vanity). All that participates in Christ is transfigured into the Kingdom of God, in which the meaning of the participation in Christ by the Holy Spirit is revealed. In history the Holy Spirit is a foretaste of this meaning - in the Kingdom of God He is its fulfilment. The calling of the Acts of the Apostles "The Acts of the Holy Spirit" qualifies them to be called the New Testament philosophy of history also. The views expressed in the discussion in the last paragraph of this section on the Pneumatology of Acts, where we have touched upon the subject of the meaning of history, are not alien to the book of Acts but implied in it.

* * * * *

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

New Testament teaching concerning the Holy Spirit reaches its climax in the Epistles of St. Paul. For Paul, the Revelation of God in Christ was a self-authenticated reality, by which the believer knew himself to be apprehended and sustained, for this was God's way of dealing with his existence. This Divine reality, which comprehended the believer in Christ and made God in Christ present to him, and brought an awareness to the believer of himself as one known by God, St. Paul calls the Holy Spirit. "Do you not know," he asks his converts, "that you are God's Temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" (I Cor. 3:16; cf. I Cor. 6:19).

Pauline Pneumatology cannot be understood in isolation, but only in relation to the Pneumatology postulated in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, which it pre-supposes. St. Paul's contribution on this is his interpretation of the same reality in relation to the problems of Christian faith, which he expounded in his letters in order to instruct his converts and help them to understand the meaning of God's Revelation in Christ by which they were grasped.

In this survey of Pauline Theology about the Holy Spirit we propose to study this problem in relation to three essential topics of Pauline Theology:- (a) The Christ/

Christ and the Holy Spirit, (b) The Holy Spirit and the Christian believer, (c) The Holy Spirit and the Church. These three - the Christ, the Christian life and the Christian community reveal the Holy Spirit, and are in turn revealed by Him. But although Pauline Pneumatology interprets Christ, as one having His Being in God without any immediacy, the Divine Presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of a Christian believer and in the Christian community is however mediated by Christ. In Him the Divine Ground is hidden in the ontological sense, but present in the existential or historical structure of being in the Holy Spirit.

The key to Pauline Pneumatology is Pauline Christology: we turn therefore to our first problem in this study:

The Christ and the Holy Spirit.

Pauline Christology is determined by Paul's experience in the encounter with the Risen Christ. His claim of Apostleship in I Cor. 9:1 :- "Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" must be interpreted as "seeing" in the sense of a vision of which St. Paul speaks in I Cor. 15:8 where he says:- "Last of all as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me. For I am the least of the Apostles, unfit to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God!" (Cf. Gal. 1:11 ff).

The/

The mention of the persecution of the Church leads us to the Acts of the Apostles, Chapter 9, which tells how St. Paul, prior to his conversion to Christianity was engaged in persecuting the Church and that on his way to Damascus where he was going for the same purpose, the Risen Christ appeared to him and asked him why did he persecute Him? This experience led to his conversion to the Christian Church and later to missionary work on its behalf. He also established the claim to Apostleship in the Church through "the special grace given to him." (Rom. ;:5).

After his experience of encountering the Risen Christ, and after his Baptism, through which he became the member of the Church, Paul found that the life of the Church was filled with Divine power and presence, through which the same Christ that he met on the road to Damascus was experienced present in the Church.

(This presence of Christ is responsible for the title "Kurios" - the Lord, by which designation Christ was called by the Christian Community). Nevertheless, in this experience of Christ in the Christian Community was revealed through another, the Divine Presence, in which the Presence of Christ realized itself. Another (Greek "allios", not "heteros") Divine Self other than Christ's/

Christ's Divine Self, apprehended the Community, bearing witness to Christ, both from God's side (I Cor. 12:3), and from the depths of the believer's existence that He, the Christ, is the Lord, who authenticated the claim of the Church that in Christ God was fully revealed. St. Paul is at one with the whole tradition of the Church in calling this immediate Divine Presence, the Holy Spirit. It was clear to St. Paul that this experience of the Holy Spirit is not only related but interwoven in the whole structure of the Revelation of God in Christ, and that the Holy Spirit must be understood as a Divine Self in whom the Person of Christ reveals the fullness of His Divine Selfhood, manifesting His Universal Lordship. The Presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church made the Church the conscious centre and herald of this revelation.

Though St. Paul accepted the Apostolic Tradition in regard to the earthly life and teaching of Jesus (I Cor. 11:23; 15:3) nevertheless he builds his own theology on the foundation of his own experience of the Risen Christ. In his letters he insists that the most important thing to know about Christ is that He is Risen and Present in the Church. This was of the greatest importance for the Church, for it saved Christianity from degenerating into a kind of dynastical caliphate, to which the Semitic/

Semitic mind is disposed. (This is seen not only from the traditional priesthood in the Old Testament, but also from the Separatist Jewish Christian Community in which the leaders were blood-relatives of Jesus. The classic example of this is Mohammedanism, where the spiritual principle is controlled by generic and historic principle of hereditary dynasticism).

The Pauline argument, "Yea, though we have known the Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know Him no more", (II Cor. 5:16 A.V.), must be understood in the light of his anxiety to ensure that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church rather than anything else should determine the nature of Christianity. Hence his stress upon the Holy Spirit and His guidance as the only meaningful principle upon which the Christian Ministry is based:- "God.... has qualified us to be the ministers of a new covenant, not in written code, but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives Life" (II Cor. 3:6). The presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church is a consequence of the coming of Jesus the Christ into history. To Paul this was the sign that in Christ "The Eschaton" has broken into history and is continuing in history in the Holy Spirit, who abides in the Church. Thus all those who are the members of the Church participate in the 'Eschaton' now./

now. "God," he says, "has put His seal upon us and has given us His Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee". (II Cor. 1:22).

* * * * *

A. The Holy Spirit in relation to Christ is the Divine Power through which Christ was vindicated as the Son of God by the Resurrection from the Dead. The visible consequence of the Resurrection is the Christian Community which exists by witnessing for and partaking of the Reality of the Resurrection of Christ (Rom. 1:3 ff). The same thought is expressed in a quotation of an early Christian Hymn in I Timothy 3: 16, where Christ is spoken of as being "..... manifested in flesh,
vindicated by the Spirit....."

This vindication by the Spirit refers to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus and through Him in the Christian Community, whose members experienced the regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, the bestowal of Whose gifts is described in Titus 3:5 as being richly poured upon the believers, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.

B. St. Paul in II Cor. 3:17 identifies the Christ and the Holy Spirit. The reason for this is His anxiety to preclude his converts from ascribing the gift of Christian freedom, and the experience of being grasped by/

by the New Life through Christian faith to any other source than to Christ Himself. The Holy Spirit accomplishes this, but He is not someone different from Christ: "The Lord is the Spirit..... and we are all being changed into His likeness..... this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit". The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (Phil. 1:19), for "Christ -- the Second Adam unlike the First Adam bestows the New Life on whosoever receives His being, for He is the Life-giving Spirit" (I Cor. 15: 45)¹.

-
1. "But the last Adam, the Man in whom at last humanity reaches its goal, has passed by the Resurrection into a spiritual existence which has the power to communicate the higher life to the new humanity which He represents", in H.B.Swete, op. cit. p. 191.

Also Hulbosch: "Il Christo è chiamato Spirito vivificante in virtù del Santo Spirito che domina interamente la sua umanità che l'ha spiritualizzata nella resurrezione. Per lo Spirito il Riposto è diventato un uomo del cielo, la cui figura dobbiamo portare. Per lo Spirito Christo trasmette la sua natura, e è diventato partecipabile".
V.P.Silverio, op. cit. p. 156

Q. The Holy Spirit is the Divine witness to Christ through whom alone it is possible for a believer to bear witness to Christ. He, the believer, does not bear witness to Christ in the sense that the witness originates in him; he bears the witness only as he participates in the witness of the Holy Spirit to Christ. The mystery of the Divine Revelation in Christ was for St. Paul so great that the profession of faith in Christ as the Lord was humanly impossible: for this meant nothing less than fathoming the depths of God where this mystery is hidden. The fact that the believer shared in this mystery and expressed this by confessing that Jesus was the "Lord" was only possible through God, who in the Holy Spirit dwelt in human hearts and made believing men able to partake in and fathom this mystery and profess the faith in the Lordship of Christ. "The Holy Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God" (I Cor. 2:10). The Holy Spirit is the witness "par excellence" to Christ as the Lord. No one could say, "Jesus is the Lord, except by the Holy Spirit". This unity with Christ is such that "No one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says: Jesus be cursed". (I Cor. 12:3).

D. By/

D. By participating in Christ, the believer also participates in the Holy Spirit, and vice-versa. Christ and the Holy Spirit are Divine "syzygy"¹; in Them God's presence in the Church manifests itself as the actuality of redemption. "You were washed, you were consecrated, you were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God". (I Cor. 6:11; cf. Rom. 15:30)².

E. For St. Paul the Revelation of God in Christ and the Holy Spirit includes also in itself and is the expression of God the Father to whom Christ and the Holy Spirit belong as the very depths of His Being. St. Paul explains that the Revelation of God in Christ reveals in the believer's experience the unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. This unity does not stand by itself, but is bound in unity with God the Father who is spoken of in the whole New Testament as the ontological ground of the Godhead.

In I Cor. 12:4, the Spirit, the Lord (Christ), and God are spoken of as the expression of one Divine unity./

-
1. "SYZIGY" (Greek: "Syzygia") has been borrowed from Vladimir Solovyov's "Meaning of Love", to describe the unbreakable unity of two beings. This unity "makes them", is creative of their being, which, without this unity would fail to achieve its inner fulfilment. (V. Solovyov: "The Meaning of Love").
 2. Raymond George: op. cit. p. 136 "Yet it is safe to say that the early Church shared in both Christ and the Holy Spirit".

unity. Also in II Cor. 13:14 the Lord Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit are invoked as the designation of God whom the Christian believer meets and by whom through Faith he is apprehended and made a partaker of His Revelation in Christ and the Holy Spirit. Here the Pneumatology of St. Paul and that of the Fourth Gospel touch each other, and show distinctly the movement in the Christian tradition, in understanding of God, away from the conception of God in the Jewish religion. For the Christian tradition of the New Testament God is ceasing to be self-contained, an undifferentiated Monad, for inside His inner life the twofold¹, or threefold² relationships exist, that of the Father and the Son, or the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. From Pauline/

1. I Cor. 8:6; II Cor. 1:2; II Tim. 4:1; Gal. 1:3.

2. Eph. 4:4-6; II Thess. 2:13 ff. Karl Ludwig Schmidt: "Das Pneuma Hagion als Person und als Charisma: Gelockerter und im Ausdruck wohl etwas zufällig ist die triadische Zusammenstellung. Eph. 4:4-6: "Ein Geist... Ein Herr... Ein Gott..." Man könnte einwenden, dass hier überhaupt keine Göttliche Trias vorliegt. Denn davor ist noch zu lesen: "Ein Leib" und darnach: Eine Hoffnung, eine Glaube, eine Taufe. "Und doch ist auch hier die Göttliche Trias vorausgesetzt, wenn zwischen Ausdrücken über den Heilstand des Christen menschen nur diese drei personhaften Grössen stehen und das Ferment des Ganzen bilden ----- Ähnlich sheht es mit der Frage, ob II Thess. 2:13 ff. die Göttliche Trias empfunden ist, etc." Sonderdruck Eranos - Jahrbuch 1945. Band XIII, p.217.

Notes: Contd.

Paul Galtier in his book: "Le Saint Esprit Esprit en nous d'apres les peres grecs", p. 25, discusses the "Trinitarian" problem in the I Cor. 12, where the Spirit... the Lord... and God are mentioned as the designation of God in these gifts to the fellowship of the Church. Galtier asks here the very important question: "Si bien Qu'on a pu se demander si le trois noms d'Esprit, le Seigneur et le Dieu, entre lesquels il les repartit tout d'abord, ne se devraient pas entendre d'uneq seul et meme personne. Interpretation inadmissible, car elle se heurte au sens constant de ces trois noms dans le langage de S. Paul; mais il resort de la que, tout en accentuant le rattachement au Saint Esprit des dons de grace, il ne songe nullement a les lui attribuer en propre".

* * * * *

Pauline theology one learns that in the Son and the Holy Spirit God is immanent in the world and that through the unity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Divine Immanence (e.g. God in Revelation) is also Divine Transcendence (e.g. God in Himself); in other words, God comprehends His creation, while at the same time standing above it.

* * * * *

The Holy Spirit and the Christian Believer.

Here we come to one of the most significant problems of the Pauline Pneumatology. The vindication of Christ through the Holy Spirit of which Pauline theology speaks, has direct relevance to the life of the Christian who believes in Jesus as the Christ, for the human existence of the believer is also vindicated by the Holy Spirit. Namely, it is lifted from the plane of the generic and historic and related to God in such a way that it finds its meaning in Him. St. Paul expresses this by saying: "Your life is hidden with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3). In this St. Paul sees that the believer in Christ is God's new creation. This is the adoption of man by God as a son, through Christ (Gal. 4:6 and Rom. 8).

The Pauline teaching concerning the adoption of man as a son of God through Christ is the fundamental thought in Pauline Anthropology.¹ The whole mystery of Divine-Human in Christ is here disclosed as the ground of the Divine Humanity of the followers of Christ. The teaching about the adoption is also a key to the understanding of the doctrine of Justification. (Tit.3:5). Christian realities such as faith, grace, righteousness are here/

1. "Anthropology" is here used in the sense - Christian Doctrine of Man.

here disclosed not as ideas which concern man's intellect, but the very structures of the believer's experience which reveal to man his own filial status, before God, through Christ. Here also is disclosed the meaning of Christ in relation to human destiny. This problem has been variously conceived. St. Irenaeus (to mention only one) describes it as "a Divination of man"¹. "Propter hoc enim Verbum Dei homo; et qui Filius Dei est, Filius hominis factus est, commixtus est Verbo Dei ut adoptionem percipiens fiat Filius Dei".

St. Irenaeus explains this thought further in the same work.

-
1. "Salum audiem Verbum et firmum magistrum sequens, Verbum Dei Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui propter immensam suam dilectionem est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod est ipse". St. Irenaeus, *Conn. Haer. Lib. V. Praef.*
v. Also St. Athanasius: *De Incarnatione Verbi* c. 54: "He indeed assumed humanity that we might become God". English translation 1944 Geoffrey Bless Press.
"Autos enenthropesen ina emeisthopoiethomen"... For other references concerning St. Athanasius' teaching about Deification V. N. Arsenew "Mysticism and the Eastern Church", p. 152.

According to St. Paul the adoption of man as the son of God is the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

"And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba'! Father!"

(Gal. 4:6)¹ The Spirit in Whom the believer's adoption is actualised is the Spirit of Christ given to him by God the Father, the same Spirit through Whom Christ knew God as His Father (and Himself as the Son). The believer in Christ receives this Spirit and through Him participates in the Sonship of Christ. In this the meaning of faith in Christ is revealed. The faith for the believer is a relationship, an act of union with Christ. The Holy Spirit constitutes in Himself this bond. "He who is united to the Lord becomes one Spirit with Him" (I Cor. 6:17). The meaning of the believer's/

1. H.B.Swete, op. cit. p.204: "The purpose of the Son was to give the rights of Sonship; the purpose of the Spirit's mission, to give the power of using them. As the former was realized in the moment of Incarnation so the latter connects itself historically with the moment of the Pentecostal Coming. But in the view of his readers' experience, St. Paul prefers to think of the mission of the Spirit as having taken effect when He entered each individual life at Baptism or the laying on of hands".

v. also J. Calvin: "Pensees sur Le Saint Esprit", p.32".
Comme Dieu par sa Parole nous promet de nous etre Pere
ainsi IL NOUS REND TEMOIGNAGE DE SON ADOPTION PAR
LE SAINT ESPRIT".

believer's existence as one who is "in Christ"¹ is comprehended. This meaning consists in the abiding of the Holy Spirit within the human self, making Christ present to it, revealing to the believer and enabling him to participate in the Divine Sonship of Christ, for whom God is the Father in the unique and absolute sense. In this the believer knows and experiences himself, by his participation in the Revelation of God in Christ and the Holy Spirit, as the adopted Son of God. Thus from the depths of his being which is strengthened and transformed by his filial status, the believer affirms God with the/

-
1. Th. Rusch, op.cit. p.24:-- "Aber das paulinische 'Sein in Christo' ist gerade nicht das Erlebniss eines 'Eingegangenseins' in das Ewige. Nur weil Gott den Geist seines Sohnes in die Herzen gesandt hat (Gal. 4:5-6; Rom. 8:15), empfängt der Mensch Gemeinschaft mit Jesus Christus und durch ihn mit dem Vater. Diese Gemeinschaft ist aber niemals eine Identität des menschlichen Wesens oder auch nur eines Teils desselben mit dem göttlichen Leben. Was der Apostel empfängt und ist was er erfährt, er leidet und erhofft das alles hat seinen Grund im Handeln Gottes, der in Jesus Christus ihm richtend und begnadigend begegnet ist. Das 'Sein in Christo' muss demnach als ein 'Sein im Glauben' (II Cor. 5:7), als ein Leben im Geiste Gottes verstanden werden".
- v. also Theo. Preiss: "Das innere Zeugnis des Heiligen Geists, p.17". Im Geiste leben und in Christus leben ist dasselbe. Der Geist ist leben, Wahrheit, licht wie der Christus, wie Gott selbst. Mit einem Worte, der Geist ist Gott wie der Sohn und der Vater. Die Christen sind auf der Namen des Vaters, des Sohnes, und des Geistes getauft. (Matt. 28:19) und der Apostel wünscht den Korinthen: "Die Gnade unseres Herrn Jesus Christus, die Liebe Gottes des Vaters und die Gemeinschaft des Heiligen Geistes sei mit euch allen" (2 Kor. 13:13).

the whole of his being as the ground and meaning of his existence. This affirmation of God by the believer is done through the Holy Spirit, by whom the believer's filial status is realised, and by whom the believer addresses God (who encounters him in Christ and the Holy Spirit) as "Abba, Father". The affirmation of God by the believer in this way is the consequence of his being affirmed by God. This Divine affirmation by God of the believer is experienced by the believer as the participation in Christ through the Holy Spirit. The life of the believer reveals that the Divine Life acts upon the existence of the believer as the constant revealing of new possibilities and the actualization of these new possibilities. God for the believer is therefore the very source of his existence in Whom he lives and moves and is (Acts 17:28). (The realization of this experience in its fullest sense as a communal reality of all believers in Christ is called in the Pauline Theology the Kingdom of God, which St. Paul describes as righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. - Rom. 14:17). The theme of adoption of which Ga. 4:6 speaks is developed in the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 8, where the experience of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer is described as the fact/

fact of their sonship. "All who are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God"..... When we cry Abba! Father! it is the Spirit Himself bearing witness with our Spirit that we are children of God... heirs of God and fellow-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:14 ff)¹. In the words of E.F.Kevan²; "We are reminded.... that we are sanctified not by a pantheistic absorption into the Divine, but by a sustained personal relation between the Holy Spirit and the one who believes". The Holy Spirit within the believer draws the personality of the believer into himself, not to override it, but to reveal to it its inner freedom, God offering to it His fellowship, as a free act of grace. The Divine and human freedoms meet each other - the Holy Spirit meets the/

1. William Temple: "Christian Faith and Life" (S.O.M. Press, 1931);

"We receive the Spirit of adoption whereby we speak of God as 'Father' and that too with the special note of tender intimacy which had been imparted into the word as our Lord uttered it: Abba, Father. This new power could only come when men received and were able to respond to the knowledge of God that is given in Christ". p. 93.

2. "The Saving Work of the Holy Spirit", p.66

the human Spirit and in this meeting, the believer's experience of his adoption as a son of God in Christ, is authenticated by the Divine knowledge of Him as God's child, which in turn becomes his own knowledge of God as his Father through Christ. Calvin called this "testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti". "In the gift of Himself God will not override His children's personalities but will go so far as those personalities with all their limitations will allow".¹

The adoption of a believer as the son of God reveals Divine Love and its self-emptying nature in relation to the believer in Christ, as the core of the believer's selfhood, as the New Creation. This love is expressed in the renunciation both of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Christ offers His Sonship (which belongs only to Him) as His Divine Inheritance to be shared with His human brethren, for it is through such an act of love that it is possible for them, to maintain their own humanity-which no lesser grace could save - from the inherent non-being in it; e.g. disobedience and self-destruction in their nature, which is the price of sin - to which man has succumbed by turning his creaturely freedom against his Creator. And the Holy Spirit/

1. G.F.Nuttall: "The Holy Spirit and ourselves", p.45.

Spirit suffers His own infinite freedom to abide within the limitations of human self-hood, to help that self-hood to attain its fulfilment in God through Christ.

Human slavery is turned into the liberty of the children of God whose existence transcends both sin and death, as God through Christ is their Father, Whom in the experience of the Holy Spirit they know and address as "Abba". Thus Dorsatz¹ commenting on Rom. 8:14-16 describes the/

-
1. Dorsatz P.A. "Notre parente avec les Personnes Divines" Saint Etienne, 1921 p.198. "Secondo le parole stesse dell'Apostolo, noi abbiamo ricevuto lo Spirito d'adozione, ma lo Spirito che conviene che e proprio che appartiene all'adozione, come lo indica chiaramente l'uso al genitivo del sonstantivo adozione huiothesis, adoptionis. E questo Spirito noi, l'abbiamo ricevuto, egli e in noi e noi siamo in Lui, perche noi siamo figli..." quoniam autem estis filii". Non si concepisce un figlio adottivo del Padre, che non sia mosso dallo Spirito del Figlio. "Quicumque enim Spiritu Dei aguntur ii sunt filii Dei". Egli ed egli solo puo metterci in relazione col Padre, farci tendere unirci al Padre. In lui e in lui solo, noi possiamo gridare Patre nostro : in quo clamamus: Abba! Pater!" v. Zedda, op. cit. p.91

the Christian life as union with Christ, which springs from our relationship with the Holy Spirit.¹ The Revelation of God in Christ, by the Holy Spirit, became for the believer in Christ not only the experience of God as a reality which encounters him in Christ, but also the experience of his own reality in God, through Christ. It brings to the believer's religious consciousness an inner awareness that in the depths of his being he meets both God and his own self-hood both belonging to each other.

This bond is manifested by the presence of the Holy Spirit which invades human life and speaks to man and on his behalf. The Pauline Pneumatology of Romans 8 calls this experience of the Divine presence, the Holy Spirit, who realises our adoption both in God and in ourselves./

-
1. "Wo Paulus den religiösen Besitz als Gottes Kindshaft beschreibt ist er ganz deutlich etwas Pneumatisches. Gottes Kinder sind die, die der Geist treibt. Was die Gotteskinder haben ist der Geist der Kindshaft. Sie rufen in ihm oder er ruft in ihnen 'Abba'. Gottes Kinder zu sein, bezeugt der Geist, nichts und niemand anderes als der Geist. Und wenn die Gotteskindshaft sich vollendet, wenn die Kinder Erben Gewordene sind, ist ihre Gotteskindshaft erst recht etwas Pneumatisches. Ihr Leib ist dann ein Pneumatischer Leib".
F. Buchsel, p.307-8.

ourselves. From this point of view one must understand Paul's antagonism to Law: 'we serve not under the old written code, but in the new life of the Spirit' (Rom. 7:6; cf. II Cor. 3:6). For the Christian does not need to be guided by something that is external and lifeless, when it has pleased God to vouchsafe to him this constant gift of Himself:- the Holy Spirit: but the Holy Spirit must not be quenched (I Thess. 5:19), or grieved (Eph. 4:30); rather Christians ought to be aglow with the Spirit (Rom. 12:11). He is the guarantee (ἀρραβών), the "first instalments" (II Cor. 1:22) and "first fruits" (Rom. 8:23) in this world of the Kingdom of God, where the fulness of our sonship in God through Christ will be disclosed. Until then the Holy Spirit helps us in our weakness and intercedes for the believers according to the will of God (Rom. 8:26 ff.) The presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer and not in all men in general, reveals two possibilities within human existence: the life according to the flesh and the life according to the Spirit. Between these two lies the conflict and the need of choice for every man (+d). Before the Revelation of God in Christ man had no choice but was under the reign of the life of the flesh - which is enmity against God - and as such/

+d. Rom. 8:1 ff.

such doomed to destruction and death (+f), being uprooted from God who is the true source of life (+c). The life according to the Spirit is a new possibility for man in so far as he believes in Christ as Lord and receives the Holy Spirit(+b). Human existence becomes grounded in God and partakes in the Resurrection of Eternal Life (+e) through the Holy Spirit (+a) in whom the victory of Christ over death and sin is made manifest as the new life for those who are in Christ - the Kingdom of God (+). Both the life after the 'flesh' and the life according to the Spirit, manifest their own nature and St. Paul gives the list of the works both of the flesh and of the Spirit (Gal. 5:19 ff) so that his converts should know the difference between the 'old man of death' who lives according to the flesh and the new man created after the likeness of God (Eph. 4:23 ff) in whom the Holy Spirit dwells (I Cor. 6:19) a++.

+f Gal. 6:8 (First half of the verse)

+c Rom. 7:5

+b Rom. 8:8

+e Gal. 6:8 "... but he who sows to the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life...."

+a Rom. 8:10 ff.

+ Gal. 5:16

a++ New Testament scholars see in I Cor. 3:16 a reference to the Church as a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, while I Cor. 6:19 is a reference to a Christian believer. "Here the application is personal and individual". J.E.McFadyen I-II Corinthians, p.83

The essential characteristic of the Christian life is the prayer in the Spirit (Eph. 6:18). In other words the whole personality of the Christian believer must be awakened to the fact that within it the Holy Spirit is realising (working out) the believer's own destiny in Christ. This realisation brings about the believer's own participation in the work of the Holy Spirit in regard to his own being. Here human freedom meets Divine Love. Here also human existence reveals itself as a paradox and a stupendous miracle; as having nothing of its own and yet at the same time comprehending within itself everything. This is the highest summit of grace, upon which man stands, but also the highest summit of temptation which may turn man into a 'daemon' and anti-Christ, should he succumb to the temptation to think of this gift of grace as his own right. The believer cannot avoid this temptation except by an act of renunciation to God, who renounces Himself also on behalf of "the man in Christ". Should the Christian live his relationship to God in this way, he will continue to possess God's gift safe from daemonic destruction in the temptation which the gift of God's grace presents to the believer. This renunciation to God and the avoidance of the daemonic is achieved by "prayer in the Spirit"./

Spirit". The meaning of this phrase is the same as "pray without ceasing" (I Thess. 5:17)¹. St. Paul explains that this reality of the Christian life is meaningful when the whole life of the believer is dominated by it ("If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit" - Gal. 5:25).

Obedience to God in Christ stands at the beginning of the Christian life; on its heights stands either daemonic destruction or renunciation to God in Love. Usually the Christian life is a constant fight between these two. This explains so much of the "daemonic element" within the Church.

This study of the Pauline Pneumatology in relation to the Christian life explains the paradox of the Pauline Anthropology when St. Paul says: "I live, and yet not I, but Christ lives in me", a statement in which the whole reality/

-
1. "Der Mensch konnte nicht beten, hatte der Geist ihn nicht im Innersten seines Herzens getroffen. Jedesmal, wenn der Glaubige das Bedürfnis empfindet zu Gott zu schreien, kann er sicher sein, dass der Heilige Geist ihn treibt, selbst wenn er dies nicht fühlt, ja vielleicht besonders wenn er gerade nichts von der gegenwart Gottes spürt. Darum auch ist das Gebet um die Gabe des Geistes eines der sichersten Zeichen der gegenwart des Geistes. Um den Geist beten heist aber um das Kommen des Reiches, um die Wiederkunft Christi beten".

v. Theo Preiss: "Das Innere Zeugnis des Heiligen Geists", p.33

reality of the Christian life is summed up as the exaltation of man through the Divine Love as the mystery of the Revelation of God in Christ and the Holy Spirit.

"Par le Saint-Esprit, Dieu échange son Fils contre nous, il transplante son Fils en nous, l'incorpore à nous, de sorte que c'est son Fils qu'il voit quand désormais il nous regarde; ce qui signifie que le Christ Jesus n'est pas né, ni mort, ni resuscité en vain; ce qui signifie notre salut"¹.

1. "Thèses Catéchétiques sur le Saint-Esprit" Verbum Caro, Vol.IV, 1950, p.127

APPENDIX.

The study of this chapter would not be complete without a short survey of a book "L'adozione a figli di Dio e lo Spirito Santo", by P. Silverio Zedda, S.J. (1) which is an extensive study of Gal. 4:6. The exact meaning of this verse has not been without dispute. The Greek text: ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοὶ, ἐκμετρίθειν οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον Ἀββὰ ὁ Πατήρ

The difficulty chiefly lies in the way in which we ought to understand the Greek "hoti de" (ὅτι δὲ), i.e. whether its meaning is causative or demonstrative. From this follow two consequences, namely, if the meaning is causal our adoption is directly in the Son, the Holy Spirit being the consequence of this Sonship and not essential to it. If the demonstrative sense is adopted, our adoption, though grounded in the Son, is nevertheless realized by the Holy Spirit and we are sons in virtue of being begotten by the Spirit in Christ. Zedda has carried this discussion through the exegesis A) of the Greek and Latin Fathers, B) the Latin exegetes of the Middle Ages until the Reformation, C) Luther and Calvin followed by the Protestant exegetes from the XVth - XVIIIth century, and D) XIXth and XXth century exegetes, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. This study is an admirable piece of scholarship. The philological discussion is carried out by Zedda in the 2nd part of his book, especially with regard to the 'pros' and 'cons' of the demonstrative and causal senses. His own conclusions which are based upon exegetical and theological considerations maintain that the true meaning of the verse is that which affirms that being the sons (by adoption) is testified by the Holy Spirit and it is the work of the Holy Spirit. This Sonship consists in being identified with Christ, one with Christ, having Christ living in oneself. All this God does in us continually through (+) the Spirit of the Son; the Son Himself works ('agisce') in us through His Spirit; through whom He lives in us and makes us participate in His/

1. "Roma Pontificio Instituto Biblico", 1952.

+ ('mediante').

His Love toward the Father. Filial Love toward the Father is an aspect of the life of Christ in us. The Son loves the Father in us and through us in the Holy Spirit (++). This understanding is forced, says Zedda, when one is dealing with this problem, and taking account of the entire theology of St. Paul about the adoption and about the Holy Spirit. Therefore he says:- "Ci sembra da abbandonare (sia campo teologico che in quello strettamente esegetico) la spiegazione Cornely-Dorsaz, che lo Spirito Santo venga dopo (posteriorità logica) che noi siamo figli"(+++). Therefore, he continues, if those who expound the formula "sons in the Son" and say this (like Marsch) that our sonship only occurs in the Son, in likeness to Him, in our union with Him, with relative identification with Him, without therefore meaning that all this happens as external to the Holy Spirit, they can support this formula also with this text in so far as in the words "estis filii" sono da intendersi tutti quegli elementi. (per la ragione del contesto Gal.2:20 and 3:26-27 and because the phrase "Spiritus Filii clamantem" would lack its full sense).

If, however, to the formula "sons in the Son" is given the sense that we are sons before the Holy Spirit "enters in action" (agreeing with the opinion of Cornely-Dorsaz) then, not only this view of the formula cannot be supported by this text (Gal.4:6), but also, says Zedda, in view of what has been said in his thesis, they contradict the meaning of the verse under discussion (1). Zedda says finally about this problem (whether our adoption is only in the Son or in the Son and the Holy Spirit):-

"Insieme con la formula 'Filii in Filio' (intesa bene) e vera anche la formula 'Filii per Spiritum Sanctum' essa trova il suo appoggio in Gal.4:6 come in altri testi dell'Apostolo'.(2)

++ Zedda, ibid. 179, ibid. 180

+++ Ibid.

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH.

The revelation of God in Christ is also a discovery of man, in the sense that he is taken out from his isolation and because of his acceptance of Christ put in relation to God and his neighbour. This relationship awakens his spirituality, because of his experience of "agape" and his response to it both in the Godward and manward sides. Through experience of "agape" the individual in him is slowly transformed into the person. Here man comes first to the awareness of his own destiny. The awareness of destiny implies man's relatedness to himself, which is the consequence of his relatedness to God and his neighbour. Thus the man 'in Christ' becomes not only the recipient of 'agape' but also its source. The man 'in Christ' is essentially the man of fellowship". (The Russian language has a most apt word by which the word "fellowship" in the Christian sense is described = "Sobornost"). St. Paul saw this clearly, and to his teaching that the revelation of God in Christ creates (or 're-creates') man, he adds that as the correlative to the re-creation of man from individual to person, the revelation of God in Christ creates also Christian fellowship, (The Church = 'Ekklesia'), through which/

which in fact the creation of man as a person is being accomplished. St. Paul is the first Christian writer who has explained the meaning of the 'communality' of the Christian religion. His ecclesiology is essential to his theology. His ecclesiology implies pneumatology, and these two are interwoven in the structure of each other. For him, as for other New Testament writers, the word 'Christian' means a member of the Community of those who profess Christ as Lord and who are grasped by the experience of the Holy Spirit, in Whom the Christian fellowship is aware of its communal meaning and destiny. How this fellowship for Paul is essential for the Christian believer is seen by the metaphor by which he describes it; "the Body of Christ" (Eph. 1: 22,23); the believer is only a 'member' of this Body and exists by participation in it, as members of the human organism do. "Now you are Body of Christ and individually members of it" (I Cor. 12:27). (Cf. Rom. 12:5 :- "So we through many are one body/

body in Christ and individually members one of another)¹. The Christian converts in the early Church very often did not join an already existing Christian fellowship, but rather, fellowship had to be created from those people who under the impact of the preaching of the Gospel, felt themselves constrained to follow its summons and separate themselves spiritually from the ways of life of the society to which they belonged. Through the preaching of the Gospel and Baptism, the converts experienced the presence and the working of the Holy Spirit within themselves. But this set a great problem, for many converts became boastful, explaining this gift of the Holy Spirit as a mark of the Divine approval which set them above other men. The danger of turning Christian fellowship into anarchy and demonising the Grace of God, by interpreting the Gift of God so possessively, was very real. It is the great merit of St. Paul that he met this danger, and canalised the forces of the Spirit working in individual/

1. "The comparison of men in society to the members of a body was of course not new. With the Stoics in particular it was much in vogue. What was distinctively Christian was the faith in the one baptizing and life-giving Spirit, the one uniting body of Christ, the one all-working, all-inspiring God".

F.S.A.Hort, "The Christian Ecclesia", p.147

individual believers in such a way that they became creative of Christian fellowship, of God's People, the New Israel.

First of all, St. Paul made it clear to his converts that the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit upon them was the sheer mercy and grace of God, completely unmerited. "What have you," he asks his converts, "that you did not receive? If then you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?" (I. Cor. 4:7).

Secondly, he explained that though God's gift of Himself to man in the Holy Spirit is free, it is not unconditional. The Holy Spirit has been given to accomplish a Divine purpose, and the gift of the Holy Spirit which the believer possesses is not directed towards him to exalt him above others, but is given for the service of the Church to which the believer belongs. "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (I Cor. 12:7; cf. I Cor. 14:2 :- "Since you are eager for manifestations of the Spirit, strive to excel in building up the Church"). And the meaning of 'the Church' is to serve and to witness to Christ as the Lord, in whom the meaning of human existence is revealed, and without whom man is precluded from partaking in the Grace of God. The Grace of God (the gift of the Holy Spirit) saves man from the emptiness/

emptiness and meaninglessness of life, which are due to man's separation from God in which state he finds himself because of sin.

Christ, by His Life, Death, Resurrection and the sending of the Holy Spirit redeems the Church from this separation of man from God. "Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself up for her, that he might consecrate her..... that she might be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:25 ff). The Church experiences this redemption by serving Christ and witnessing to Him as the Lord. "There are varieties of service but the same Lord (I Cor. 12:5). It is the Christ to whom ultimately all the service of the Church is directed. For this purpose the members of the Church possess variety of gifts, but these gifts ought not to be set one against the other by those who are diversely endowed by them, for the source of all these gifts is one: The Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:4). The whole of the 12th Chapter of I Corinthians is a plea of St. Paul to his converts, to see that all the various gifts he enumerates in this chapter are the gifts of the same Spirit; and those who possess those gifts should for their own part receive them with gratitude and humility to accomplish a service of the Church to which they are called. And they/

they must see to it not to think that they are the only ones upon whom the Holy Spirit bestows his gifts, but they must recognise his working in the lives of others and honour them and work with them, whom the Holy Spirit favours by giving to each one his gifts, individually as He wills (I Cor. 12:11)¹. The Christian believers, being apprehended and inspired by one and the same Spirit, must work together so that there is no discord in the body, but that the members may have the same care for one another" (I. Cor. 12:25)....."and may know how to behave in the household of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and bulwark of the truth (I Tim. 3:15).

St. Paul reminds his converts that it was through Baptism that they entered into the life of the Spirit whence they received gifts (I Cor. 12:13). And they therefore should not sit in judgment upon the Spirit, but acknowledge Him, as the reality by whom the Christian life is lived in Christian fellowship, which the Holy Spirit joins to Christ, who gives the Spirit. The Holy Spirit/

1. "Les dons ou 'Charismes' divers impartis aux fideles pourraient paraitre appartenir en propre au Saint Esprit. Ils font suite a sa venue dans les ames. Quels qu'ils soient graces, fonctions, ou operations, ils s'exercent tout dans L'Esprit" (I Cor. 12:3 et 7) et manifestent tous l'Esprit".
Paul Galtier, op. cit. p.25

Spirit knits the believers into such unity with each other in Christ, that He makes the Christian fellowship the Temple which is "the dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:22, cf. I Cor. 3:16; II Cor. 6:16). ("The Church is the Temple of God", says Hort, "for His Spirit, by inhabiting their community or 'ekklesia' made it into a shrine of Himself" - Hort, op. cit. p.130).

The Church is therefore one body made alive by the common participation in "one Spirit" (Eph. 4:4), therefore the individual should strive not to impair this essential unity which God bestows upon the Church, but give it expression by living in mutual concord and peace with the other members of the fellowship, by letting their human will be taken possession of by the Spirit and made the instrument of the unity, which the Spirit (who is the very soul of the Church) constantly bestows upon the Church (Eph. 4:3).

The Spirit reveals to the Church the mystery of Christ, by the Apostles and prophets (Eph. 4:3 ff), whose existence in the Church means that the Church participates in the mystery of Christ. But this participation must not be shown forth by suppressing the rational part of human nature by obscurantism or unintelligible speaking with tongues, but by making the mystery of faith intelligible so that the others may profit and be instructed and upbuilded/

upbuilded in the common faith. For the life of the Christian is not turned towards his own salvation but towards the salvation of his neighbour also. This is the reason why St. Paul tries to encourage prophesying in the Church and is anxious that 'speaking in tongues' may be discouraged. (I Cor. 14:1 ff).

'Speaking in tongues' insofar as it is a movement of and the impact of the Holy Spirit in the believer's soul, is good. That is why St. Paul's attitude towards it is not completely negative, for 'speaking in tongues' has in it a possibility which is good, and has great potentialities; what St. Paul objects to is unwillingness on the part of those who spoke with tongues to "wrestle with the Spirit" within themselves and try to understand Him, and express Him intelligibly so that the Church, and he in whom the Spirit is active may be led to a deeper understanding of God and Christian faith. 'Speaking with tongues' is a movement of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church towards prophecy, which is frustrated because of the abandonment to emotion of those possessed by the Spirit, without participating in the action of the Holy Spirit in order to comprehend action of the Spirit rationally and make it intelligible. This seems to me to be the most probable explanation of the thorny problem of 'glossolalia' in the early Church. This view seems to/

to be enhanced by the fact that in the Church there were also interpreters of 'glossolalia'. They were probably the prophets - people who had had similar experiences to those who were speaking with tongues, but who were able to comprehend the meaning of the Spirit and make it intelligible.

The Holy Spirit (as some conceptions of grace suggest), does not bestow the gifts ('charisma') upon the Church as something which comes from Him and is external to Him. The Holy Spirit is present in His gifts. The Holy Spirit encounters the believer who is the recipient of gifts, as a personal Divine self, and helps man to understand the gifts bestowed upon him and teaches the believer how to use them rightly in order to accomplish God's purpose for which they were given (I Cor. 2:13). The Holy Spirit authenticates Himself, but only in the world where He is operative. Thus for instance the preaching of the Gospel which is prompted by the Holy Spirit finds its authentication in the hearts of those who possess the Spirit.¹ While "unspiritual/

1. Gregory Dix: "The Prophet and the Church" II. An article in *Sobornost*", December 1939, p.8. Dix discusses whether the Christian dogma may be judged by "objective scholarship", namely i.e. by those scholars who are not existentially involved in Christian Revelation. He denies this by saying: "In fact, the human scholar with his human technique can never be the judge of the God who acts in revelation or the arbiter of what is tolerable for faith, even though the disinterested and patient human search for truth is in itself a noble and Godly thing."

"unspiritual man" does not receive "the gifts of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him," he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned" (I Cor. 2:14 ff.) Therefore the Church and the Christian revelation mean nothing to a man who does not receive the Holy Spirit, for without the Holy Spirit he cannot understand the revelation of God in Christ, nor can he participate spiritually in the life of the Church. The Holy Spirit is the Divine self through whom a believer is grasped by the revelation of God in Christ. The Holy Spirit is also the door through whom the Christian believer enters the Church, knows God as the Father, and Christ as the Lord. Such a man is the New Creation of God fashioned in the likeness of Christ because of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in him. Such a man is not an individual but rather a person, for his life is bound up with the life of the Christian fellowship, with the Church. The believer therefore partakes of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, celebrated in the Church, to show forth sacramentally the reality of the Holy Spirit, through whom he is made to participate in Christ. This participation in Christ opens the individuality of the believer towards the Christian fellowship (all those who participate in Christ), from which he receives 'agape' and to which he returns 'agape'./

'agape'. In this a relationship of interdependence is established between the believer and the Church. (The Sacraments of the Church are Pneumatocentric, because they are Christocentric; the Pneumatocentric understanding of the nature of the Sacraments is sadly lacking in certain forms of Christianity).

* * * * *

St. Paul's eucharistic teaching¹ brings out most forcibly that the act of partaking in the Lord's Supper is in a real sense the believer's participating in Christ. The Bread in the Eucharist is the Body of Christ, and the Wine is the Blood of Christ. This common participation, St. Paul insists, must be done in brotherly love, for it must be permeated by the knowledge that the participation of the believers in Christ implies that the believers in Christ are also members one of another, and that their participation in Christ must be accompanied by awareness that they have a common destiny, and that being in Christ means also participation in each other². The eucharistic teaching of St. Paul fails to be understood fully without the understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which underlies his teaching. In the experience/

1. I Cor. 11:17.

2. This was expressed by the Holy Kiss (the Kiss of Peace) practised at the eucharistic gatherings.

experience of the Holy Spirit, he knew Himself to be participating in Christ existentially (to use a modern category); namely, the life of a believer (qua believer) is sustained by Christ, as the physical life of man is sustained by eating and drinking. It is through the experience of the Holy Spirit and the understanding of His meaning for the life of the Church and the believer, and also through the understanding of the relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit, that the Bread of the Eucharist is the Body of Christ and the Wine is the Blood of Christ.

The Pneumatological character of the Sacraments is indeed impossible without a Pneumatological understanding of Christ. This means that Christ must be understood historically, humanly, empirically, immanently, as the man Jesus, but this side of His being is never self-contained, but only one part of the constellation, the second part of which is metahistorical, Divine, apocalyptic, transcendent, where the man Jesus is apprehended by the Holy Spirit and is revealed as the Christ. In other words, the Divine revelation of God in Christ demands, in order to be understood, the Person of Jesus and the Holy Spirit. It is interesting to notice how in Western Christianity where the Pneumatological understanding of Christ is lacking, how the eucharistic/

istic teaching betrays this. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in which the understanding of the eucharist reveals itself as a Divine-human reality 'sui generis' has been supplanted by an interpretation in terms of philosophical categories which ultimately reveal, not the Divine-human dialectic of the New Testament revelation (Christ and the Holy Spirit), but this dialectic is set within the categories belonging to monistic-immanentist-philosophical world view posing as the interpretation of Christian faith. Thus for Roman Catholics, for instance, this dialectic is between the inorganic and organic world: bread and wine, flesh and blood (Transubstantiation). For the Lutherans this dialectic is between spacial categories of time and space: here and everywhere (Ubiquitas Christi)¹. For Reformed Christianity the dialectic is between the external world of objects: bread, wine, and the world of subjects, man/

1. It is interesting to notice the kinship these Luthern categories ("Here and everywhere") and the Roman Catholic teaching about the repetition of Christ's sacrifice expressed in categories of "now and always".

man and his faith, both of which belong to this world¹.

The eucharistic interpretation of Christ in Pauline theology is only possible in the experience of the Holy Spirit, who binds the destiny of the believer to Christ in such a way that he knows himself to be 'in Christ' and that his being in Christ constitutes "ipso facto" his being in the Church. That is why the Lord's Supper is a corporate act of the Church in which the Love of its members is manifested one towards the other. Behind the celebration of the Eucharist stands the experience of the Holy Spirit who makes Christ present to the believer ---- as the very being of his selfhood, and the experience of the Holy Spirit who unites all the believers in Christ into one Body. It is with this in view that Christ instituted the Eucharist. The Eucharist as described above is implied in the promise of the Holy Spirit. Those who see it only as 'a commandment of Christ' fail to understand it fully².

-
1. In connection with this discussion v.E.Lampert "The Divine Realm" Part III.3. 'Metabolism', p.125. The whole of the part three of the book is of much interest to a student of sacramental theology. Unfortunately it is rather short.
 2. The later development of the "epiclesis" (the 'Calling upon' the Holy Spirit) was indeed implied in the Eucharist from the beginning, and it was made explicit in some parts of the Church in the time when the understanding of the Holy Spirit in the Church was weakened. Its usage in the Eastern Orthodox Church has been invaluable/

Notes: Contd.

invaluable, for it has kept the Pneumatological understanding of the Church alive, revealing the meaning of the Eucharist as the expression of the spiritual reality of Christian faith, i.e. participating in Christ through the Holy Spirit rather than obeying external "ordinance of Christ". Epiclesis is affirmation that the Church lives by the presence of the Holy Spirit in it. Thus I personally find Western Christian Eucharistic teaching unsatisfactory as it is not sufficiently based upon the dynamic and personalistic understanding of the God-man relationship as revealed in the New Testament. It is not difficult to see how the interpretation of the Lord's Supper as mere remembrance in some extreme forms of Protestantism is the logical consequence of Roman Catholic interpretation of the Lord's Supper as "the Divine Ordinance of Christ", sufficient in itself. This would not have happened if the Pneumatological significance of the Eucharist had not been lost. This loss was due to the separation of Christology from Pneumatology. Thus the right understanding of both was distorted. Hence the relevance of the study of Pauline Pneumatology for the right understanding of Christian faith.

The best study of epiclesis is contained in the book: 'Eucharistia', by the Russian Theologian Dr. Kiprian Kern, Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1947 (In Russian) pp. 233-286.

Kern explains hostility to epiclesis in Roman Catholic Theology as being due to the exclusive Christocentrism upon which it is based. "The priest, according to Roman Catholic understanding of the act of celebration of Eucharist is not only "representing Christ" as the fathers taught (Maxim Confessor), but he also possesses the whole fulness of Christ authority. He acts as Christ Himself has acted at the Last Supper. The words of institution of the Sacrament which are found with E. Orthodox only in the context of the narrative about the Last Supper and have only a historic significance, are for the Roman Catholic Theology 'sacrament consecrating formula'. Those words are pronounced in "persona Christi", while epiclesis is not pronounced in the person of Christ. The priest is "Vice-Christus" and therefore Roman Catholic can rightly deny the necessity of epiclesis. 'L'epiclèse au sens stricte du mot, ne est pas nécessaire'. If Roman Catholics admit consecrating/

Notes: Contd.

consecrating action of the Holy Spirit, He is only sulleiturgos Mitconsecrator. The Greek Theologians from the Roman Catholic point of view stress the consecrating power of the Holy Spirit too much, while in fact consecration is the act of the Holy Trinity". *ibid.* p. 257.

(v. Also E. Lampert *op. cit.* p. 130. 'Epiklesis').

* * * * *

The Teaching concerning the Holy Spirit in Other New Testament Writings:

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Pneumatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews bears a similarity to the Pneumatology of the Pauline Epistles. They are indeed reasons for treating the Pneumatology of the Epistle together with St. Paul's teaching, as does H.B. Swete (ibid. p. 248). The Christological theme in this Epistle is "The Christ as the High Priest" and it is original; in consequence, the Pneumatology of the Epistle is original also, for it explains the High Priestly nature of Christ. The High Priestly office, according to the O.T. consists in the entering of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies and in the offering of the sacrifice. The Epistle to the Hebrews describes Christ as the fulfilment of both offices in an absolute spiritual sense. That is why Christ, according to the writer of the Epistle, is the High Priest of the New Covenant. Christ's High Priestly sacrifice of Himself, is described as being offered through the Eternal Spirit and without blemish (Heb. 9:14). This verse expresses the thought of the Gospels/

Gospels where Christ is described as One who lived in the Holy Spirit and because of this revealed in Himself victory over the disruptive forces of life, sin and death. Christ's life, because of the presence of the Holy Spirit in it, becomes God's revelation, and Christ's death is therefore not a helpless surrender to death but an offering of obedience to God through the Eternal Spirit¹; in this is accomplished the conquest of death by Christ, through the Spirit who was in Him. Thus Christ's death was God's revelation also, for in it the Holy Spirit manifests the Divine victory over death in Christ, whom the Holy Spirit reveals as the Lord.

The Holy of Holies in which Christ enters as the High Priest is "Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf" (Heb. 9:24)². Because of the nature of His being and the nature of His sacrifice, Christ manifests in Himself "once-and-for-allness" of God's dealing with the world and with man (Heb. 9:12,26; 10: 10,14). This once-and-for-allness of Christ consists in the fact that by the fullest manifestations of the Holy Spirit in the human existence of Christ, God has wholly accomplished His purpose in regard/

1. Hebrews 5:8.

2. cf. Hebrews 7:25

regard to man and history, and there is nothing to be repeated. There is a participation in the victory of Christ, but not a repetition thereof. (In this respect the interpretation of the Roman Catholic Mass as a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ is in direct opposition to the teaching of the Epistle).

In this once-and-for-allness of Christ lies the uniqueness of Christ. Through Christ the Holy Spirit establishes God's victory over sin and death, and in the Holy Spirit He in whom this has been accomplished (Jesus the Christ) is the Lord in the Glory of God over the Kingdom thus established. Through Christ, the Spirit is continually present in the world, gathering the whole of history in Christ, making the once-and-for-allness of Christ an actuality for all those who believe in Him as the Christ. This reality of the once-and-for-allness is present in the believer in his experience of the Holy Spirit, through whom the believer partakes in Christ, as the Saviour. That is why the blood of Christ who is the Mediator of the New Covenant accomplishes the cleansing of man's sin uniquely (Heb. 9:14 ff), because through Christ's death the Spirit accomplishes victory over sin and death. The death of Christ becomes a saving event, and as such an ever present event in man's/

man's experience of salvation, because of the continual presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer. In Hebrews 2:4 the Holy Spirit is spoken of as One in whose gifts the New Testament Kerygma is authenticated, as God's Word, delivered by the Lord (Christ).

The writer of this Epistle in 6:4 discusses the possibility of the restoration to the Christian faith of those who have fallen away, and he thinks this to be an impossibility. The reason he gives is that those who enter into the Church are made partakers of the Holy Spirit and have tasted the goodness of the Word of God and the power of the Age to come. Their apostasy is therefore a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of which Mk. 3:28 speaks, for they have deliberately denied what they knew once to be God's truth. By denying it, they have turned into a falsehood, and thus there is no more truth in them to make them free (in 8:32)¹. (God's truth in the New Testament is always Christ and the Holy Spirit).

This theme is discussed in 10:29 ff., where the denial of the Son of God is described as the outraging of the Spirit of Grace. This verse strengthens the view expressed earlier in this thesis in connection with Mk./

1. Compare with this Acts Chap. 5. The case of Ananias and Sapphira.

Mk. 3:28 ff., that the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a denial of Christ to whom the Holy Spirit bears witness as the son of God, God's own Truth. The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit means exactly this. The Holy Spirit does not meet us in any other way except in Christ. It is through Christ that man encounters the Holy Spirit, and has a possibility of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. (The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a sin which is only possible in the Age of the New Testament revelation, because of a possibility of denying Christ, which is 'ipso facto' a denial of the Holy Spirit, whom Christ reveals and in whom Christ is revealed).

In this Epistle also, the Holy Spirit is also mentioned as the Inspirer of the Old Testament Scriptures (Heb. 3:7; 9:8; 10:15). This view is common to the New Testament and arose to explain theologically the testimony to Jesus the Christ, which the Primitive Church argued was to be found in the Old Testament. According to the New Testament, the knowledge that Jesus is the Christ is ascribed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, as we see in I Cor. 12:3:- "No one can say Jesus is the Lord except by the Holy Spirit".

* * * * *

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

This Epistle makes contribution to the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit, only in one place, Jas. 4:5. 'The Scripture says "He yearns jealously over the Spirit which He has made to dwell in us". F. Buchsel says that here Epistle of James expresses the general Christian conviction that the Christians bear the Spirit within themselves. The writer does not conceive the Spirit as the power (Als Kraft), but as the personal being, who has personal relation to man and claims personal devotion of man (Hingabe). The holiness of the Spirit is bestowed not so much that man may be sanctified (as this is the case with Epistle to the Hebrews), but that man is engaged in keeping himself holy - desiring to be perfected. This view corresponds to the general ethical and religious structure of the Epistle".¹.

The/

1. F. Buchsel, op.cit. p.462.
- v. Also Swete op. cit. p. 256 ff.

The mention of the Scriptures here is not the Old Testament. Swete suggests that it must be attributed to some lost Jewish Christian writing (op.cit.257). Dibelius connects it with Shepherd of Hermas and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Buchsel says that the connection between Jas. 4:5 and Hermas Man. d.III, is in fact very small.

The writer seems to suggest here the common Christian thought that God who, through Christ, bestows upon us His Holy Spirit in this act. God gives Himself to us in order that through Him we may achieve our destiny which is the fellowship with Him in Christ. Such is God's love towards us that He loves us with and as His very self, for He gives His selfhood to us (The Holy Spirit), and our nearness to Him or our distance from Him, are His own triumph of fulness of life in fellowship, or tragedy of separation.

* * * * *

1st. EPISTLE OF PETER.

In this Epistle, the Holy Spirit is spoken of as Sanctifier of Christians. This sanctification makes obedience to Jesus. In other words the Spirit makes the believer participate in Christ, so that Christ in the believer accomplishes his reconciliation with God. In this sense we must understand the meaning of Petrine description of believers, as those who are chosen and destined by God, the Father, and sanctified by the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus and for sprinkling with his blood, I Peter 1:2.

The Epistle to Hebrews, as we saw earlier, speaks of the death of Christ as the willing offering of Himself to God, in which act His death is not a defeat or an end, but victory of the Spirit, which is the beginning of the new life of the Spirit, who through Christ has won the victory over disruptive forces of man's existence because of man's disobedience to God.

First Epistle to Peter speaks of this victory of the Spirit as being not only the victory of the Spirit in Christ over the future, but also over the past. This victory is so great that it is declared by Christ to the world in which the spirits of men who have died live and "who formerly did not obey, when the patience of God/

God waited". (I Peter, 3:18 ff)¹.

This Epistle is at one with the rest of the New Testament writings in describing the believer in Christ as one upon whom the Holy Spirit rests. (Called in this Epistle the Spirit of Glory because in Him, the glory and victory of Christ is revealed, which is the glory and the victory of the believer, for the Holy Spirit makes him to share in Christ). (I Peter, 4:14).

And, lastly, the Holy Spirit is spoken of as a chief agent in whom the testimony is borne to Christ in the Old Testament by the prophets, for the Spirit of Christ dwelt in them. The New Testament preaching also is not a human device but an act of the Holy Spirit, who is sent from Heaven, who reveals the mystery of Christ to man. And this mystery surpasses even the knowledge of angels, for such is God's favour showed to men. (I Peter 1:10 ff; cf. II Peter 1:21).

-
1. The ideas expressed here presuppose the Jewish teaching of Sheol. The idea of "harrowing of hell" as it is usually described in religious fiction, found in this Epistle, was responsible for the creation of Petrine Apocalyptic literature in which this idea is given a play of fancy, e.g. Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter.

1st. EPISTLE OF JOHN.

The theology of this Epistle should always be discussed with the fourth Gospel of which it is a continuation. Our study of the New Testament Pneumatology has made this difficult, for the Pneumatology in these two writings stands in dialectic relationship to each other. If we try to understand the New Testament Pneumatology schematically, and speak of the presence of the Holy Spirit in history in resting upon Jesus as His own endowment as a thesis (this is the teaching of the synoptics), then the promise of the Holy Spirit to the disciples by Jesus in the fourth Gospel may be described as an antithesis, for here a kind of self emptying of Jesus on the behalf of His followers is manifested. But in the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church, the life of Christ reaches full synthesis, for it includes in itself, through the Holy Spirit, the participation of the believers. The 1st. Epistle of John speaks of this synthesis and thus we have studied it in the third part of this chapter. While the Fourth Gospel speaks of the knowledge of the Holy Spirit in future, because the disciples have known Christ. In this Epistle Christ is known by the Spirit which He has given to/

to those who believe in Him (I John 3:27; 4:13).

This Epistle was written partially to combat the docetic heresy and the witness of the Holy Spirit is directed to testify the truth of Christ's real humanity. As in Paul, I Cor. 12:3, no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says "Jesus be cursed", and no one can say "Jesus is the Lord" except by the Holy Spirit.

So in 1st. Epistle of John 4:1 ff., the presence of the Spirit in the life of a believer leads him to the confession that Jesus the Christ has come in the flesh, while non confessing this faith, but to explain it as docetism did is a work of anti-Christ.

In the earthly life of Jesus the Christ two happenings stand out as disclosing the abiding of the Holy Spirit upon Him. Namely His Baptism and His Death on the Cross. The Holy Spirit revealed His own presence in the Death of Jesus the Christ in the Resurrection, by which the Holy Spirit manifested the conquest of death by Jesus the Christ. "This is He", says the writer, "who came by water and the blood, not with the water only but with the water and the blood, and the Spirit is witness because the Spirit is truth (I Jn. 5:6-7). This witness of the Spirit is known to the believer in the baptism and in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper through which Christ/

Christ Himself communicate His own being to the believer. For the believer participates in Christ through the Holy Spirit. In the Sacrament of Baptism and Lord's Supper, the Holy Spirit reveals the unity of Christ and the believer. "There are three witnesses, The Spirit, The Water and the Blood, and these three agree" (I Jn. 5:8). The writer sees further in the experience of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life, the testimony of God "That He has born witness to His Son" (I Jn. 5:9).

* * * * *

EPISTLE OF JUDE.

This Epistle describes the life of the believer as filled with the Spirit. The Holy Spirit in the believer works for the building up of the fellowship with other believers. Those in the Christian fellowship who stir up divisions are described as worldly people devoid of the Spirit, and the believers are exhorted to pray in the Holy Spirit so that through prayer He may abide in their hearts. The presence of the Holy Spirit creates the experience of the love of God, in which, through the Holy Spirit, the redemption of the believer by Christ (who in this Epistle, like elsewhere in the New Testament, is called Lord Jesus Christ) is accomplished and he is made partaker of the eternal life (Jude 17 ff).

The above interpretation has been inferred from the Epistle, but the quotation from Enoch in verses 14 and 15 suggests that verse 21 speaks of the Immanence of Paroussia. In this case the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle is to prepare the believers to be ready spiritually for the Paroussia, so that they may participate in it, instead of being taken by surprise.

* * * * *

THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

The Pneumatology of the Book of Revelation is directed entirely towards the destiny of the Church. The Holy Spirit is engaged in preparing the Church for the Paroussia. Before the Paroussia takes place, God's judgment upon the world must take place. This judgment is due to the rejection of Christ. The Book of Revelation echoes here the same thought expressed in the Fourth Gospel.

The Holy Spirit, according to this Book of Revelation, guides the Church through the Prophets. The writer who himself was a Christian prophet, describes his own destiny as the mouth-piece of the Spirit to the Church. This is seen from the saying in the Book of Revelation "He who has ear let him hear what the Spirit says to the Churches", Rev. II, vs. 7, 11, 17, 29.
III, vs. 6, 13, 22.

The Spirit therefore takes the prophet into the secret of God's dealing with the world, and reveals it to him, so that he may help the Church to interpret the meaning of events which are taking place, and therefore know her own attitude. Rev. I. 10; cf. 4:2; 17:3; 21:10.

The prophecy in the Church is therefore the expression of the testimony of the Holy Spirit to Christ as the Lord.
Rev./

(Rev. 19:10.) The prophecy in this book is considered as the truth, about the things of which it speaks, for it comes directly from God, who is described as the God of the Spirits of the Prophets, (Rev. 22:6.) The Spirit himself not only inspires prophecy but also testifies to it, Rev. 14:13. (Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth. "Blessed indeed" says the Spirit).

The work of the Spirit in the Church is directed towards the end - to prepare the Church for the coming of Christ.

The Spirit and the Bride say "Come" (Rev. 22:17).

Pneumatology of the Book of Revelation presents its student with a difficulty in regard to its mention of "the Seven Spirits", who are described in Revelation 1,4 as "standing before the Throne of God". (cf. Rev. III, 1: 4.5). The Book of Revelation has been stumbling-block to many a commentator, for it has led them by its metaphorical way of speaking into many a fanciful interpretation. Taking the risk of this, my opinion is that "the Seven Spirits" is the metaphor for the Holy Spirit. This conclusion is imposed upon me by the fact that in this Book the Spirit is guardian of the Church. He is teacher of the Church, its life and its voice./

voice. In this Book the Church is spoken of in terms of seven Churches to each of which the Holy Spirit is speaking in a different voice, according to its need and its problems. Thus the Church which is "One Bride" is also "Seven Churches", so the Spirit, who is one Spirit, is expressed in the Seven Churches so differently that in His Kenosis adapts himself to each of them in such a manner that He metaphorically is described as "the Seven Spirits", for He gives Himself completely to each of them¹ and, just because the witness of the Seven Churches to Christ was different from each other, these marks of the diversity of the Church are borne by Him who is therefore, though one, "seven also". Here we have to do with the mystery of the Kenosis of the Holy Spirit.

-
1. He also gave Himself uniquely and completely to each of the Seven Churches - suffered and rejoiced according to the measure these Churches witnessed and expressed Christ.

A P P E N D I X.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

One of the crucial problems in the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the problem of the "personality" of the Holy Spirit. For the moment let us postpone the difficult problem of what we mean by "personality" and "personal". It suffices here to say, that by "personality" is meant experience of the meeting of the two selves, in which each recognises its self as I being addressed by a Thou, or as Thou being addressed by another I. We ascribe "personality" to any selfhood with whom we experience this relationship.

In the survey of the New Testament Pneumatology, I have constantly referred to the Holy Spirit in personal terms. This may seem somewhat arbitrary, as the "personality" of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is not self-evident. Generally speaking the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is spoken of as a personal divine Self, as Christ's own risen Self, and as a charismatic power of God. Catena of the New Testament passages maybe brought to support each of these views. This has been done often enough in the past, so that to argue this problem on the ground of Scriptural texts seems superfluous. Moreover, the problem of the "personality" of the Holy Spirit did not arise in the minds of the New Testament writers. The impression we gather from the New Testament is that the members of the Primitive Church were conscious that from the depths of God, since Pentecost, corporally and individually, they experienced guidance and the presence of a Divine Self, through whom they were grasped in such a way that the Risen Christ was present to them as an eschatological reality, and in this experience they knew themselves as God's people living at the end of time. This Divine Self they called the Holy Spirit. Sometimes the New Testament uses the name of the Holy Spirit for the charismatic gifts. And this is as far as the New Testament goes, being a record concerning the events which took place in the Primitive Church and the experience of its members. Judged in this "objective", spectators' way, the New Testament teaching leaves us without any real answer on this problem, either for or against the "personality" of the Holy Spirit.

However,/

However, those who profess the lordship of Christ from Pentecost till now are not related to the New Testament as spectators, but as participants in its revelation. This forces upon them the existential understanding of the New Testament, i.e. the existential questions of the New Testament become my problems as a believer in the lordship of Christ. My experience as a believer includes my encounter with the Divine Self, by Whom I am asked the question: "Whom do you say that Jesus of Nazareth is?" This question is ever present in every moment of the believer's life. Whenever he calls upon Christ as the Lord, he is answering this question and thus showing that it is ever present with us. Secondly, in the act of the answer: "He is the Christ, the Son of the Living God", the believer is aware of an act of communion between God and himself, and the divine personal Self says to the believer "Thou are So-and-so". The divine Selfhood which the believer experiences is the presence of Christ. Incidentally where the answer to the question is not given as an affirmative of Christ's lordship, or where the judgment is suspended, then man does not experience an intensive presence of the Divine Self, he finds himself being in monologue with himself, without Divine participation in his question and answer. This does not mean that the question put to him is not from God but that by his negative answer he precludes the possibility of God's Holy Spirit revealing Himself, as a Divine personal Self bearing witness to Christ. Thirdly, the presence of the Divine Self which encounters the believer in his faith reveals the Divine reality of Christ as the ground of the believer's destiny. Nevertheless, this Divine Self also testifies concerning Christ: it speaks about Christ as He to whom the believer should turn, should witness and love etc., bearing witness to the believer, that Christ's testimony concerning Himself is true.

The believer experiences that this same Divine Self also testifies to Christ concerning the believer, revealing to Him the depths of his being. In this Divine Self, Christ and the believer know each other, as belonging to each other. The believer experiences this Divine Self as Christ's other Self, the Comforter. When this experience is related to the New Testament then it authenticates itself therein as the Holy Spirit Who is a personal Divine Self, and being this Christ is personally present in Him, for a Divine Self of Christ could be revealed only in another Divine Self. The believer does not experience Christ directly, but in and through the Holy Spirit, nor (and here I am in faith making a statement for/

for the possible disagreement with which I beg excuse) does Christ 'experience' us as His own in the unique and Christian sense of oneness unless the believer is revealed to Him in the Holy Spirit. cf. Romans 8:9; "Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to Him".

Through this existential understanding of the New Testament it seems that the only way to know Christ in the Synoptic Gospels is by accepting what I think the Synoptic Gospels are anxious to point out viz. that the Holy Spirit rested upon Jesus as the personal Divine Self revealing to Jesus His own Divine Selfhood, and also revealing to Him God as His Father thus making Him the Christ. With regard to the primitive church as we find it in the New Testament, it seems to me that we misunderstand the whole experience of its members if we do not see the meaning of the Holy Spirit to be, the Divine personal Self Who filled up the life of Jesus, and through Jesus was bestowed by God upon the Church, revealing to its members Christ, and making them to participate in Him. This is not to say that all its members were clear about this any more than Christians are today, but without the Holy Spirit and Him understood in some such way as this which I have been trying to explain, the whole revelation of God in Christ and the Christian life is not explicable. If the Holy Spirit is not personal Divine Self, neither does Christ come to us as personal, and our ideas about the personality of a believer are an illusion.

* * * * *

APPENDIX.TEACHING OF SERGIUS BULGAKOV CONCERNING THE PENTECOST.

In his book "The Comforter" (Russian edition 1936, Y.M.C.A. Press), Bulgakov discusses the meaning of the Pentecost (pp 304-324). He asks what is the meaning of the Pentecost? And answers: Its distinct character is not in charismatic gifts, this we find also in the Old Testament. What is new in the Pentecost is the coming of the Holy Spirit in the hypostatical (personal) sense. In Pentecost He is not limited to His being descended upon the Virgin Mary (Bulgakov takes the birth narratives in the Gospel seriously) and Christ, but also upon the Apostles, as also upon those who were with them. This coming of the Holy Spirit includes in some sense all men and moreover the whole world. (In iconography, the icon of the descent of the Holy Spirit expresses this thought by including in itself the symbol of the transfiguration of Cosmos). The descent of the Holy Spirit on the Pentecost is analogical to the coming of the Word in incarnation.

It is true, Bulgakov says, that the attentive reading of the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles speaks rather of a charismatic than of the personal presence of the Holy Spirit. And furthermore, this is the case with the whole book of Acts. The situation at the Pentecost where it is said that the Holy Spirit came (ἐγένετο ἡ ἑξουσία) (Acts 2:3), may be compared to the incident of the Baptism of Our Lord where the Holy Spirit did not come in the dove, as if He were indwelling in the dove, but (ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) (Matt. 3:16) (ἐγένετο) (Mark 1:10, Luke 3:22, John 1:32). The tongues of flame were emblematical vision, and not hypostatical indwelling of the Holy Spirit in flame. All these external signs are only manifestations of the Spiritual happening - coming of the Holy Spirit. "And suddenly a sound came from Heaven like the rush (ἐγένετο) of a mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them tongues of fire distributing and resting on each of them" (Acts 2:2-3). In this, says Bulgakov, we have an indication that in the Pentecost we have an objective spiritual happening expressing itself subjectively in the inner feelings of those present.

The personal character of the coming of the Holy Spirit/

Spirit is witnessed in the Pauline Epistles¹. It is true that the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit though present in the world, is manifested in His gifts only. It is not possible, however, to come to Him as it was possible to approach the Son of God, revealed in Jesus the Christ. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are not unknown to the Old Testament, but the difference is this: in the Old Testament, these gifts are given, so to say, transcendently; on the Pentecost they are given by the Holy Spirit in Person, who has come to dwell in the world, e.g. immanently. On the Pentecost, gifts are not only given but the Holy Spirit comes in His person also. The Pentecost reveals the fact that the Father sends, not one but two hypostasises, not only the Son but also the Holy Spirit. The coming of the Son is manifested in His becoming Man, but the coming of the Holy Spirit does not manifest Himself in like manner. Here we stand before the mystery of Divine economy. In the Son the unity of Divine-human is revealed. In Christ's leaving the world in Ascension the bond of Christ and humanity is not broken. On the contrary, the Holy Spirit through Whom this bond is actualized in Christ (for He descends upon the Virgin Mary and on God-Man Jesus Himself - the fullness of God-Manhood in Jesus and its actuality is the Holy Spirit). The Holy Spirit seals this bond after the Ascension, as the life of Christ in humanity and the life of humanity in Christ. In this is revealed the fact that Christ is never separated from the Holy Spirit. This coming of the Holy Spirit signifies the New act in God-Manhood, the return of Christ in the Holy Spirit, who is 'another comforter', as commentators rightly say allos and not heteros, nor another in a sense of other and new, but the same, but manifested by an other. This comforter is one but in a sense of being biune; He is the Christ anointed by the Holy Spirit, who abides on Him, continually; or the Holy Spirit who without separation and without merging abides on Christ and therefore manifesting Christ in Himself-two manners (forms or moments) of the only one God-Manhood. The Holy Spirit does not abide in Christ in a charismatic sense, but in a personal sense and only the hypostatic abiding of the Holy Spirit in the world is sufficient to bring into the world the life and the power of the incarnate Lord, His own abiding in the Holy Spirit. No charismatic power, but the Holy Spirit/

1. Bulgakov Ibid. p.306

Spirit Himself, has sufficient power to continue and accomplish the work of the God-Manhood of Christ which the Holy Spirit Himself has fashioned. It is of course implicit that the Hypostatic coming of the Holy Spirit brings also the fullness of His gifts.

The Pentecost reveals hypostatic coming of the Holy Spirit in all the fullness of His gifts, and at the same time there was not His hypostatical revelation. His hypostasis remains invisible and unknowable to the world. This is the limitation of the Pentecost for us. The Pentecost in this sense is charismatic but not yet hypostatic manifestation of the Holy Spirit. In regard to the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which are always poured upon the Church, the Pentecost is the happening, which although it has abiding power in its consequences, there is no finality in it. On the contrary, that happening had in itself the beginning, but has no end. While the Son manifests Himself in a concrete historic person in a particular place and time, such concretion in the coming of the Holy Spirit is not present. Historically and empirically, His abiding is secret. Nevertheless, if a man should convince himself that there is no Holy Spirit, but only psychological emotion, he would see himself in a cold, dead satanic world, and experience spiritual death prior to the physical death. But He the Holy Spirit comes and man abides in another than himself, experiencing fulness in particularity, in poverty riches, in sorrow of semi-existence the eternal joy, in tragedy - catarsis, in dying the triumph of eternal life; in death-resurrection. The coming of the Holy Spirit into the world, is final coming, which does not know for itself return to Heaven or intermittancy. At the same time His coming into the world does not mean leaving the depths of the Holy Trinity, in which the Holy Spirit eternally abides uniting Father and the Son and abiding upon the Son. Rather the coming into the world means uniting God and the world, in the act of making man Divine (theopoiein) which in the heart of creation was accomplished by Christ, and in the Holy Spirit becomes irrevocable property of the creature. In each particular case giving of the Holy Spirit is accomplished also by His hypostatical coming, for the Holy Spirit Himself gives His gifts Himself. The gift in such sense is the gift of the Holy Spirit, and at the same time the Holy Spirit is not that gift, for He cannot be exhausted in His gift.

In Paroussia Christ will manifest not only His power but also His person. And what about the Holy Spirit asks Bulgakov/

Bulgakov: will the Holy Spirit manifest His person, or the world will remain forever without knowing Him, except only as the power of Divine inspiration? Here we stand, he says, before revealed mystery concerning the manifestation of the Holy Spirit. The coming of the Holy Spirit is similar to the coming of the Son of God which also was His kenosis. The same is the case with the Holy Spirit. At the same time kenosis of the Holy Spirit must be understood differently from the kenosis of the Son. The kenosis of the Son consists in putting aside His Divine glory in self-belittling of the Divine life in the God-man which becomes through the encounter with vicissitudes of human existence and overcoming of them His earthly life. The Holy Spirit does not divest Himself of the Divine glory for He is the Divine glory in His hypostatic being. His kenosis consists in His being bound to the world and His coming into the world is signified in His creating the new bond between God and man which transcends the bond existing prior to His coming into the world. The Holy Spirit abides in the world by the power of Christ becoming man. The power of the Holy Spirit abiding in the world is limited by this measure of His being received by the world. The kenosis of the Holy Spirit consists in His self-willing limitation in the face of creaturely freedom and indifference. The coming of the Holy Spirit from Heaven meets however hindrance or limitation of the world, therefore He remains also above the world seeking to permeate it, making it Divine in uniting Himself to the world. Therefore the kenosis of the Holy Spirit extends to the whole of our aeon.

In the Holy Spirit the reign of Christ is being accomplished by the power of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit who has come into the world has not completely dwelt in us (hence our constant need of a prayer to Him - "come and abide"). He is only constantly inspiring us, therefore Christ Himself though He is the King, He does not reign only, but on the contrary, "in the form of a servant", suffers together with His human nature, although He is in Heavenly glory. Because of this mutuality of Christ and the Holy Spirit, there are different manners of the kenosis of the Son and the Holy Spirit; they interweave and unite themselves in one final act - the coming of the Kingdom of God. The basic text concerning the reign of Christ, (I Cor. 15:35) "For He must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet", is related to the action of the Holy Spirit upon the world, to the power of the Pentecost. In this is resolved an apparent contradiction between the glorification of Christ in/

in Heaven and continuing of His kenosis in His kingly service upon the earth. With this last kenosis, the kenosis of the Holy Spirit is united. Christ reigns in the world by the Holy Spirit. And therefore the kenosis of the Holy Spirit expresses itself as the kenosis of the glorified Christ. This paradox seems to be a contradiction from the point of reflective static thinking, which is only overcome in the living stream of Divine-human activity of making creation Divine.

Therefore comes the fundamental fact with fullest self evidence: The Pentecost will continue in the world in which once it took place, and it will not finish until the end. But finally this continuation of the Pentecost of our aeon, is not for ever lasting infinity which does not await its fulfilment in completion. On the contrary, the continuing Pentecost is directed towards its fulfilment in Paroussia, in Eschaton, when God will be all in all.

* * * * *

PART II.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

---I. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD ---
GOD AS THE TRINITY

A PROLEGOMENA

"Our God is One, but not alone".
St. Hilary.

It is very often admitted, even by those who do not share Christian convictions, that Christianity brought about tremendous revolutions in many aspects of human life, spiritual, intellectual, social. It is not very often pointed out however, even by Christians, that all the revolutionary changes ascribed to Christianity mentioned above are consequences of one major revolution, namely, the new conception of God which Christianity has created. Christianity was born inside the monotheistic Jewish faith, and was, for a while, considered to be only a sect of the Jewish religion. (Some of the early Christians, those who came from Judaism, considered themselves good Jewish monotheists.) But soon it became clear to the members of the Christian community that the New Testament teaching, and their own experience, made it impossible for them to maintain the Jewish conception of God; that is, of a Being whose inner life is not an outgoing of Himself to Himself, in such a way that the unity of His being includes a relationship of love, whereby the Divine Self recognises Himself as revealed in another Self, inside His very being, through Whom He comprehends, knows, and loves Himself. In other words, Christians realised that the Jewish God, though one, was not personal but abstract, as His ego is in monologue with itself and not in dialogue with His Personality, which knows/

knows itself through the other and in the other in an act of mutual love. Ego in monologue is incapable of Love or revelation, hence non-being, an abstraction. (1).

Christianity did not come to this conclusion by way of philosophical reasoning, but by Revelation; namely, by accepting the Lordship of Jesus, the Christ, as the Son of God in a unique and absolute sense. This faith brought an awareness on the part of those who confessed it both during the earthly life of Jesus and after His resurrection, that in dealing with Jesus, the Christ, as one thus confessed, the believer is brought into the presence of God, where he recognises himself as a sinful creature, and, because of his acceptance of Jesus, the Christ, as the Lord, also as the adopted Son of God. In this experience of the presence of God, God addresses the believer in such a way that He does not point to His own majesty and power in order to 'put the man in his place', by revealing to him his own creatureliness and powerlessness before the Creator; but rather addresses man by/

1. V. Dom Mark Pontifex: "Belief in Trinity", Page 60.

"The unity of the individual, as such, is of course more perfect than that of the group, but the point is that the individual cannot realise his nature as an individual by himself in isolation, therefore the unity of a group is not from every point of view less perfect than that of an individual, because in the group the individual can exercise his natural powers. Paradoxical though it sounds, his individuality is only realised in the group."

/by revealing to the believer His own inner life, where the Son loves the Father, and the Father, in love, gives everything into the hands of His Son. It is the wonder of God's inner life, which Christ reveals, which determines the Christian conception of God. This, at once, explains to a Christian how it is possible for God in the Old Testament to speak of Himself: "I am that I am". Ex.3.14. - with an inner self-revelation of His own being as a personal autonomous being, fully self-related. The Jewish religion, whose conception of God remains abstract, may explain this self-knowledge of God, by saying that it comes to God by comparing Himself to man, whose being by comparison is contingent and relative; while God knows Himself as Being in an absolute sense, not threatened by Non-being as is the case with man. This is the height of the argument, concerning the self-knowledge of God, which may be brought from these religions whose conception of God is determined by the Old Testament (i.e., Judaism and Mohammedanism). This argument however is destroyed by the Old Testament itself, which declares that the world and man are God's creation and a posteriori to the being of God, Who must have had consciousness of His own self prior to the act of creation, in order to create that which is outside Himself.

Apart from this difficulty, even if we assumed that Platonic philosophy teaches the eternal co-existence of God and the world then it would mean that for His self awareness God is/

/is dependent on the world, and has therefore no aseity in Himself, and this is contradictory to the revelation of God both in the Old and New Testaments.

Christians must ask both Judaism and Mohammedanism, how God, whom these religions portray as an undifferentiated monad, knows Himself. The question is not answered by pointing to its impertinancy. The God of Judaism and Mohammedanism is a demon rather than a God of love, for love is an act of outgoing of one's self to the other and return of the other, in sacrifice, to the self which bestows love. If it is said, from the Jewish or Mohammedan point of view, that God does not need to share love within His own being in order to bestow it upon man and share it with him, it can be pointed out that love is an outflowing of one's being, and it is difficult to see how the being of God, as an undifferentiated monad, could overflow in love, and have love as a movement in His being, since on the contrary such a God is shut up in Himself. He might command, but not love, even if we were to allow that God, as an undifferentiated monad, could have self-knowledge. Ultimately, such a God is never determined by Himself, but by His creation, for His creation is necessary to bring Him out of His loneliness. This really means that such a God is not qualitatively different from His creation since He could be limited by it. That which is necessary always limits the being to which it is necessary.

The Christian God is not limited by His creation but only by Himself, which is to say that in Him abides His own personel/

/personal fulness of being, which creation reveals but does not limit. This implies an absolute freedom, which may be called also Love, in God. According to the Christian conception of God, creation is not a necessity to God but the expression of the over-flowing love in His being. Love is the expression of freedom.

The Platonic idea that Love is the expression of the 'Lack' within the being, rather than an expression of the fulness of the being, (and therefore a human but not a divine reality), is also true, and Christianity does not deny that this point of view of Greek philosophy shows insight. Christianity and Platonic philosophy, however, differ in their understanding of love. What the Greek philosophy here calls Love is Eros, and this could be better translated as the 'desire of an uncomplete being for its completeness', which is a necessity of being or a striving within being. What the Christians call Love is Agape, the manifestation of the fulness of being within God which reveals His own fulness. Thus, in creation, God acts upon the non-being outside Himself and calls it into being, making things which 'are not' to be, by bestowing upon them freely the gift of His being.

In the New Testament the Synoptic Gospels express this drama of God's inner life as the love of Jesus, the Christ, (whom the New Testament confesses as "the Son of the Living God),/

/God"), and God, the consciousness of whose unique Fatherhood Jesus possessed and called Him Father. The fourth Evangelist, and Saint Paul, while accepting fully the teaching of the Synoptics concerning this revelation in the earthly life of Jesus, the Christ, speak about this relationship as being grounded in God in the eternity preceding the creation, thus asserting that the earthly life of Jesus, the Christ, is only the revelation of this eternal relationship, and not a new occurrence in the inner life of God.

Jn. 17.5,24. The only new factor is that God, since the Incarnation of the Son, or the Word, in Jesus, the Christ, experiences the outgoing of Himself, from the Father to the Son, as an outgoing into the human self-hood, also, which Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, incorporates in and with his Divine Self. The fourth Evangelist expresses this eternal (pre-existent) relationship of the Father and the Son in the classical words of the Prologue: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God".

Jn. 1.1. (1)

(1)

There has been much discussion concerning the real meaning of the word in Jn.1.1. - "Kai Theos en o Logos". Many, like Moffatt, translate it 'divine', while others translate it 'God'. This controversy is by no means new; it was raised in Christological controversies of the IV Century. G.L. Prestige in his book, 'God in Patristic Thought', quotes Cyril of Alexandria (on St. John 11090) who recalls "quite accurately" the textual point that, in St. John 20; 28:, our Lord is called "The Theos" by St. Thomas, when he said after the Resurrection: "my Lord and my God". "ho Kurios Mou Kai o Theos mou".

(G.L.Prestige, *ibid*, p.146.) This argument from Jn.20.28: strengthens the view of those who translate it 'God'.

(V. also Oscar Cullmann: 'Early Christian Worship' p.43)

Saint Paul, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, speaks of the pre-existent relationship of the Father and the Son; the Son who was incarnate in Jesus the Christ, and who bears in Himself the equality with God. Nevertheless, He, the Son of God, does not assert His Divine Self, as something to be self asserted and made a display of (Greek: *Arpazein*); but, in response to the love and self-emptying of the Father on the Son's behalf, the Son also "emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of man. And, being found in human form, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Therefore God has highly exalted Him, and bestowed on Him the Name which is above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, in Heaven and on Earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father". (Phil. 2.4, ff.)

In the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, 12. 3, Saint Paul says explicitly that the Christian confession, concerning the Lordship of Jesus, is the participation in God's knowledge concerning Himself. This self-knowledge of God, is in the Spirit, Who "searches even the depths of God" (1 Cor. 2.10), and the same Spirit not only reveals to God His own Being, but reveals God's Being to the believer; - "God has revealed to/

/to us through the Spirit" (1Cor. 2.10), for God, through Christ, bestows upon the believer the Holy Spirit, Who makes the believer to participate in the self-knowledge of God Himself. Hence the believer's confession that Jesus is the Lord.

To avoid enlarging this Thesis unduly by the number of Biblical references, suffice it to say that the above quotations sum up the New Testament position, which sets the problem concerning the Christian conception of God, rather than answers it, pointing only the way in which it ought to be answered; namely, that God is not an abstract, numeric, undifferentiated monad, but the Unity of being revealed in Jesus the Christ in which the Father and the Son participate in each other's being, so that neither are two separate beings, (dualism), nor two aspects of one being, whereby their distinction is only apparent but not real, (monism, modalism). Rather, the inner life of God is a constant revelation of the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, in an act of mutual love, which 'personalizes' and authenticates God to Himself and to His creation.

If the New Testament left us here we should still be unable to construct any intelligible Christian doctrine of God, but it takes us a step further, for it declares that the relationship of/

/of the Father to the Son is expressed as the act of the Father's bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the Son. Thus, from the New Testament we gather the following data for the construction of the Christian doctrine of God:-

- (1) God is the unity of Being expressed in the relationship of the Father and the Son, and,
- (2) The key to this relationship is in the Holy Spirit, Whom the Father bestows upon the Son, and in Whom the Son recognises Himself as the Son of God, and, in the power of the Holy Spirit, reveals the love for the Father as an act of constant obedience to the Father. These two points in the New Testament explain the existence of the fluctuation between 'bynitarian' and 'trinitarian' tendencies in the description of the reality and experience of God in the New Testament revelation. What the New Testament means by this 'bynitarianism' and 'trinitarianism' is simply the assertion that God is one only, and unique Being, (in agreement with Judaism); but not in an abstract, static, impersonal sense, (in disagreement with Judaism), but in a personal sense: He is related to Himself through the participation of the Father in the Son, through the Holy Spirit Whom the Father bestows upon the Son, and through the participation of the Son in the Father through the Holy Spirit, Whom the Son receives from the Father. And here the New Testament teaching concerning God stops. It is clear/

/clear that the New Testament does not bequeath to us a systematic presentation of the Christian doctrine of God, but only fundamental rudiments, the implications of which are left to be worked out by later generations.

The generation of Christians which produced the New Testament seems to address itself, to the subsequent generation of Christians, on the problem of the presentation of the Christian doctrine of God, "We have tried to record in a written form the revelation of God in Jesus the Christ, of which revelation we have living witnesses and the recent tradition. We have gathered this tradition in a written record, bringing out those elements and dealing with those problems which, religiously and theologically, were issues amongst ourselves and amongst those to whom we preached this Gospel. But, in order that we may not be perfected without you, in the full understanding of this revelation, you who are like us partakers thereof by the Holy Spirit received also by you, and fellow-heirs in the salvation through Christ, you are demanded to work out fully the Christian doctrine of God implied in this revelation. You are to use our foundation as the starting-point, and to add to the structure of the building those elements which your own Christian experience and spiritual and intellectual insights reveal, always guarding from corruption that which has been bequeathed to you, seeing to it that/

/that you pass to the coming generation of Christians both what you have received of, and added to, the Christian doctrine. That which we are building and which you will be building is nothing other than "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and bulwark of the truth". (1 Tim. 3.15.)

B. Development of the Christian Doctrine of God in
2nd and 3rd Century - (Tertullian and Origen)

The history of the Christian Church following the New Testament period, or, as it is often called, the Sub-Apostolic period, shows that the first step, in working out in detail the Christian doctrine of God, was to answer the problem - "In what sense can Christ be called God, and what is His relationship to the Father"? (1) The theological activity in connection

(1) The historic survey of the Christological heresies prior to the Council of Nicea, 325 A.D., and afterwards, is not the aim of this Thesis. Any book on the history of Christian doctrine contains this.

(a) It ought to be mentioned that, while the theologians discussed the Christian doctrine of God chiefly in terms of the Father-Son relationship, the Church confessed a Trinitarian faith from the earliest times. To mention a few examples:-

(i) V. Didache, Chap. VII. "Baptize into the name of Father, Son and of the Holy Spirit in living water."

(ii) St. Ignatius. 'Epistle to the Magnesians:'
 "Submit to the Bishop just as did Jesus Christ in the flesh, to the Father, and as the Apostles did to Christ and the Father and the Spirit "Chap. XIII. /

(iii)/

(iii) Justin Martyr '1. Apology' 1.6. "We confess that we are atheists so far as gods of this kind are concerned, but not in respect of the most true God, the Father of Righteousness Both Him, and the Son who came forth from Him, and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore knowing them in reason and in truth". Cf. also ibid. 1.61.

(iv) St. Irenaeus. Adv. Haer; 1V.20.1.

(v) Tertullian. Ad Praxeum 11 "The Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit: Three however not in condition, (statu), but in degree; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in aspect".

(vi) Origen. "De. Princ." 1V. 1.28.

(vii) Clement of Rome. 'Epistle to the Corinthians:'. "Do we not have one God, one Christ and one Spirit of Grace, the Spirit that was poured upon us. And is there not one calling in Christ"? 46.6.

In this study there is only a passing reference to some of the Christological heresies. V. also J. Armitage Robinson: 'Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Justin and Irenaeus', in the introduction to his translation of St. Irenaeus: "The Apostolic Preaching". S.P.C.K. 1929.

/connection with this problem, both amongst those who defended the traditional beliefs of the Church and the heretics who attacked them, shows that the Christian revolutionary conception of God was beginning to be understood and explained theologically more adequately. Two factors made it enter very often into bypaths. Christian theologians of this period, while asserting the divinity of Christ, reveal that their Christian faith, expressed in their theological statements had elements of compromise both with Judaism and with Greek philosophy, shown especially in the doctrine of the Subordination of Christ, the Son of God to the Father in such a way that His being is derivative from the Father. Eminent theologians like Origen subscribed to this. By Subordination Christian theologians hoped to defend themselves against the Jewish accusation of introducing the plurality of Gods, and also to impress upon the philosophically minded Greeks, that Greek philosophy supports the Christian contention concerning God, who, though not one in the Jewish sense - an undifferentiated monad - is one in the sense of having principle of priority which determines His unity in the expression of inter-relationships inside His being. The Jewish static and impersonal conception of unity, and Greek philosophy were alien to Christian thinking and so were unsatisfactory tools with which to deal with Christian realities. This kind of argument/

argument may be best illustrated from Tertullian and Origen.

Tertullian, with the help of Stoic philosophy, formulated theologically the Christian doctrine of God. This philosophy postulates as the principle of all being, one living rational Substance which is both Spirit and matter. In this, Tertullian saw justification for the Christian doctrine of the one-ness of God. This Stoic substantia, principle of life, has within itself also the principle of self differentiation. (scheseis - relationes). In this Tertullian saw justification for the Christian doctrine of God, in regard to the differentiation which takes place inside the being of God. Instead of the one substantia of Stoic philosophy, Tertullian postulates God the Father as the source of the whole Godhead. (Pater total substantia est: Adv. Prax. C.9.). Prior to the creation of the (1) world, God was one (solus), having within Himself His reason. God's reason is the inherent power of God (exis) and the rationality through which God knows Himself. (sensus ipse est: Adv. Prax. C.5.). In the act of Creation, the Word, through Whom God creates the world, receives His form and His beauty - becomes the Son, the Only-begotten (unigenitus ut unus ex solo Deo genitus), existing in and differentiated from God (Adv. Prax. C.7.26) (2)

1. This divine rationality is unuttered logos who is imminent in God in an undifferentiated form, and a mere potentiality of the Logos - Word; this is not the word in its full differentiated sense, who reveals Himself.
2. Father Sergius Bulgakov says that in this statement of Tertullian lies a doctrine of the later Arius. "There was a time when there was not the Son who was made God to be the Father". (Bulgakov: 'Utyeshitely.' P.14.

Having explained the differentiation of the Godhead as the Father and the Son, by making the Son derivative from and subordinate to the Father, Tertullian goes on to explain the appearance of the Holy Spirit as a further differentiation of the divine life. According to Tertullian, the Holy Spirit was given by God the Father on the petition of His Son after His ascension. (Adv.Prax. C.25.). The Holy Spirit is subordinate, not only to the Father, but also to the Son because the Holy Spirit comes after the Son; the reason for His existence being the continuation of Christ's work upon the earth - the creation of the Church. The Holy Spirit is "tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio sicut tertius a radice fructus ex fructice". (Adv.Prax. C.8.). (Here lies the root of the unbiblical doctrine of filioque). The difference between Tertullian and the Jewish conception of God is that Tertullian allows differentiations inside the Godhead, but these differentiations are only personal. (Persona was a legal and theatrical term which stood to denote 'gradus and species unus substantiae'). It is evident that Tertullian's God is not the God of the Christians revelation, whereby the eternal fulness of His personal being, which is ever present in Him, is revealed; but some Divine pantheistically conceived Substance which passes through a theogonic process and as such is never really personal, for the forms of temporarity are inherent in Him. 'Primus secundus tertius; prior et posterior, major et minor'.

The/

/The God of the New Testament stands beyond these categories, that is why He is the Saviour because He transcends the contradictions inherent in being, because of the process of becoming in it, and is able to reconcile them through Himself. The God of Tertullian is involved in the process of becoming, and, like the creation, is ever unrealised potentiality. The personality and the personal, in relation to God, in Christianity mean self determination and self realisation through the eternal differentiation of God, and that means that the categories which Tertullian ascribes to God mentioned above have no place in Him. God's inner life is eternally out-going from the one person to the other and in this out-going the 'persons' reveal each other and participate in each other in such wise that they reveal their belonging to each other, manifesting the oneness of God as the essential structure of the being of God and at the same time preserving their own hypostatical reality as the essential structure of the divine life in the oneness of God.

Unlike Tertullian, (for whom the existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit is essential to account for the creation of the world and the Church), Origen explains differentiations inside God not as having cosmological reasons but ascribes those relationships as taking place in the very depths of divine life, in the eternal transcendence of God, subsisting in/

in Himself and revealing Himself to Himself. 'Nam et haec ipsa nomina temporalis vocabuli significantiam gerunt id est quande vel nunquam supra omne autem tempus et supra omnia saecula et supra omnem aeternitatem intellegenda sunt ea quae de patre et filio et spiritu sancto dicuntur. Haec enim sola trinitas est, quae omnem sensum intellegentiae non solum temporalis verum etiam aeternalis excedit' (De. Princ. 4.1.28.). (1).

In formulating his own doctrine, Origen follows the philosophy of neo-platonism, as taught by Ammonius Saccas (Origen was one of His disciples). This philosophy according to Porphyry was taught later by Plotinus, and in order to understand Origen's doctrine of God it is necessary to give a short summary of the teaching of Plotinus on this subject. (2). According to Plotinus, the ground of all being is the Absolute One (En). This Absolute One is revealed to itself, and knows itself, in the logos. The logos is being born eternally in the Absolute One as the manifestation of power and perfection contained within the Absolute One. The logos is the second God which contains within itself the transition from the one to the many. This many is the expression of further differentiation of One through the logos into the Soul of the world. (The Absolute One, logos and the Soul of the world, are the unity and the differentiation of the Ideal being which is transcendent to the phenomenal being). The material being/

1. Origenes Werke Vol.V. Leipzig 1913.

2. Summary partly based on S. Bulgakov 'Utyashitely' p.27ff.

being has its own ontological ground in the Soul of the world. The creation is not due to a creative act ex nihilo, a concept of creation alien to neo-platonism, where the creation is conceived of as a farther fall of the One which loses its spiritual and ideal character and becomes matter. The important thing to remember in neo-platonism is that the idea of the One dominates and includes in itself its differentiations.

Origen borrowed these neo-platonic categories and instead of the Absolute One, logos and the Soul of the world, of the neo-platonic philosophy, postulated God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit of the Christian Religion. This is seen in the way Origen describes God the Father, for He in fact bears great similarity to the Absolute One of Plotinus. He, (God the Father), is unreachable, inexplicable, incorporeal and unchangeable. He is beyond truth and wisdom and light which arise from Him. God the Father is God par excellence. (ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ) He is in fact the Absolute One, the first God of neo-platonism. Origen carries his neo-platonic analogy further and applies it to the Christian doctrine of God. He says that it is necessary to postulate differentiation, (or out-going), in the being of God the Father. God the Father has within Himself Divine Power (virtus dei). (1). This power of God proceeds from God/

1. "Intellegenda est ergo 'virtus dei', qua viget, qua omnia visibilia et invisibilia vel instituit. Vel continet vel gubernat, qua ad omnia sufficiens est, quorum providentiam gerit, quibus velut unita omnibus adest" De Prin. I:1.9.

God as the will does from the mind. This will of God becomes Divine Hypostasis in its own right. (1). This is the beginning of the Son from the Father and is what the apostle in Hebrews 1.3. calls not only the brightness of His glory but also the express image of His person, or subsistence (*substantia vel substantiae*) (ibid.1.2.8.). This begetting of the second hypostasis from the first makes the Son subordinate to the Father. This subordination is of a transcendent and eternal nature and therefore the begetting of the Son must not be thought of in any human and temporal sense, such as is found in the later sayings of Arius when he thought of there being a time when the Son was not. Origen in his doctrine of God touches implicitly the doctrine of 'homoousion' taught by Athanasius. Because of this, in spite of his subordinationism in the doctrine of God, Origen is not guilty of being a precursor of the Arian heresy as is the case with Tertullian. (De Princ.1. Ch.2.). The Holy Spirit, on the analogy of the neo-platonic doctrine of God, proceeds from God the Father through the Son. From the Son all that has being receives being (including the Holy Spirit) while the Son Himself receives being from the Father. The Holy Spirit therefore receives His being, not only from the Father, but also from the Son from whom He also receives wisdom, rationality and truth: (In Joa 10.6. V. Bulgakov ibid.P.32.). The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and/

-
- 2
1. ibid "Huius ergo totius 'virtutis' tantae et tam immensae 'vapor', et ut ita dixerim, vigor ipse in propria subsistentia effectus quemvis ex ipsa virtute voluntas ex mente procedat, tamen et ipsa voluntas dei nihilominus dei virtus efficitur. Efficitur ergo virtus altera in sua proprietate subsistens".

/and the Son. (De Princ. IV. 32.)

Origen's doctrine of God may be summed up thus. The Father is the ground of the Godhead. The Son receives his hypostasis from the Father directly, the Holy Spirit through the Son. The Son is the ontological ground of the world which is fashioned through Him. The Holy Spirit is the ontological ground of the Church. (This is the meaning of Origen's teaching that the working of the powers of the Father and the Son extends to every creature but a share in the Holy Spirit is possessed by the saints only. (De Princ. I. III. 7.)). Those things which have their ontological ground in the Holy Spirit have their ground in the Son - as 'supra transcendent' ground (if we may speak thus) - for the Son establishes the Church by His incarnation, and the Church, through the Holy Spirit, participates in Christ, for the Holy Spirit finds His own Divine ground through the Son and in the Son. (1) And again what is grounded in the Son has its ultimate ground in the Father. (Here we are reminded of the Absolute One of Plotinus). The difference between Origen and Tertullian is that differentiations in God are for Origen eternal real subsistencies or hypostases rather than *formae*, *gradi*. Yet this hypostatical being of the Divine life is ultimately dominated by the monarchy of the Father. The reality of the differentiations or hypostases which take place in God is subordinate to the principle of the Divine Oneness of God, which is in the Father, Who is the fulness of the Godhead in the absolute sense, - the Son and the Holy Spirit do not contain this fullness in themselves but only through their participation in the Father upon/

(1) H.B. Swete: 'The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church' P.128.

/upon whom their beings depend. "Therefore", says S. Bulgakov

"In Origen naturally arises the thought that prayer (προσευχή) strictly speaking must only be directed to the Father". (1)

The Christian doctrine of God as presented by Origen really means that necessity is ever present in the Divine Life and as such, the Christian doctrine of God, when construed on the principles of alien philosophical categories in order to maintain the compromise with the Jewish conception of an abstract and numeric unity in God, falls short of understanding the God of New Testament revelation, in whose inner life, love and freedom exclude necessity and its counterpart, subordination.

G. Development of the Christian Doctrine of God
in the 4th Century - (St. Athanasius).

While Christian theological thinking on the Doctrine of God was producing alien garments with which to clothe a distinctly Christian doctrine, the spirituality of the Christian believer felt itself uneasy under the servitude of these artificially composed categories of Christian theological thinking and their subordination in the doctrine of God. Subordinationism in reality meant that God was in Christ in a relative and conditional sense and the spiritual life of the Christian believer could not bear this, for the existence of a Christian believer revealed, that life in Christ carried within itself unconditional surrender to God Whom the believer meets in Christ in an absolute sense. When Arius, the heresiarch/

(1) Bulgakov ibid P.32.

heresearch of the 4th Century initiated subordinationism, relativity, and the derivative character of the Son as the true Christian doctrine of God, it came home to the Church what the compromise with Judaistic and Greek Philosophical thought really meant. The Church and its Theologians at Nicea rose to assert more boldly the oneness between Father and the Son. Thus it was stated concerning Christ: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father; that is of the essence (ousia) of the Father, God of God. Very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father". (1)

Here there was a decisive step towards the asserting Christian doctrine of God against its subservience to the Jewish conception of Unity and the categories of the Greek philosophy which interpreted this doctrine in terms of subordination. At Nicea, and ever since the Christian doctrine of God was stated paradoxically: namely, God is the unity of being (ousia) in an absolute sense, and also He is not an undifferentiated monad but in Him exists diversity of subsistencies, or hypostases. This unity and this diversity are ever present in Him and neither of the two has primacy over each other in Him. This assertion agrees with the Christian experience of God of the New Testament Revelation, whom the believer encounters always in the Unity of His Being and/

(1) Daniel Lament: 'The Church of the Creeds,' P.37.

/and, yet, in the same time, God reveals Himself in the believer's experience in the reality of His diversity of hypostatical being; namely, He encounters the believer in the immanence of his existence in the world. Here God must be understood as Christ or the Holy Spirit, who encounter the believer in the reality of their hypostatical selfhood. (This is never, of course, apart from the experience of the reality of the whole Godhead, i.e., revelation of His Transcendence and Freedom - God the Father.)(1) What the theologians at Nicea with their ousia and hypostasis achieved was simply to say that the God of the Christian Revelation is revealed in the reality of the Unity and Diversity of being simultaneously and that neither of those two could be conceived without the other/

(1) G.L. Prestige: "God in Patristic Thought" Introd. XlII.

"My own conviction is that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is a legitimate rational construction founded on the facts of Christian experience".

V. also Theo. Preiss "Das innere Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes". P.17. "Dieses Dogma, das auf den ersten Blick als eine befremdliche Spekulation, ein standiges Ausbalancieren von Widersprüchen erscheint, ist doch der am wenigsten falsche Ausdruck des Geheimnisses des in Jesus Christus Fleisch gewordenen und durch den Geist offenbarten Gottes".

This is best seen from the usage of words; ousia and hypostasis, which are interchangeable. (1). And it was only after long discussion (2) that it was decided that the meaning of 'ousia' stood to denote the reality of God in that aspect of His being in which the unity of the hypostases of His being is revealed, and the meaning of 'hypostasis' to denote the eternal reality of the 'individual subsistences' in Him, without any subordination of these two principles to each other. In here the personal living God of the New Testament Revelation is, for the first time, grasped dynamically as He reveals Himself, and therefore the statement concerning Him is by the nature of the case expressed paradoxically. Here is implicitly dismissed uneasy compromise between Christian thought on one side, with Judaistic religion and Graeco-philosophical thought on the other. (3). (I write "implicitly" advisedly, because/

-
1. Hypostasis and ousia, says Athanasius, (ad. Ap. 4) mean 'existence' for they are and they 'exist'.
G. L. Prestige *ibid.* p. 275.
 2. C. Raven: 'The Creator Spirit', p. 24: Also R. S. Franks: 'The Doctrine of Trinity', p. 114.
 3. "The result of this insistence on the identity of the ousia is seen in the changing emphasis with which the doctrine of the Monarchy now comes to be regarded. There is no longer any suggestion that God is one simply by reason of the fact that the second and third person may in the last resort be resolved back into the first person, since they derive their origin from Him. The fact now comes to be emphasised is that the Father is manifested in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, wholly and without any detraction. The three persons no longer lead back to a unity that is primarily found in one person, they are in a real sense one in themselves." G. L. Prestige: *ibid.* p. 233.

/because explicitly the full comprehension of the Christian doctrine of God, as independent from Judaistic and Greek philosophical thought, has not been fully asserted. This is best seen from the continuous charge the Christian theologians make against each other, either of 'modalism' or 'tritheism' in their respective constructions of the Christian doctrine of God).

For the sake of simplifying the problem in this study of the doctrine of God I have pursued chiefly the Christological side in the Christian doctrine of God, in order to show that the Christian revelation and the Christian experience ultimately compelled Christian theologians to cease to be dominated by the Jewish conception regarding the unity of God, and to cease interpreting their theology by making constant compromise with Judaism. God who has revealed Himself in Christ is not an undifferentiated monad, as some Christian heresies which were attempts to reinstate Jewish conception of God, such as patro-passianism of Paul of Samosata (d.272) and Modalism of Sabellius (c.300) were anxious to assert. In Christ the reality of the Father and the Son is revealed, both as the unity of one God: for the Father and the Son belong to each other, but together with this unity, their differentiated selves are revealed, as constant outgoing of God from the Father's self to the Self of the Son. In other words, the Christological problem in the/

/the Christian doctrine of God clearly reveals that the Christian doctrine of God must be built on the principle of the Unity and Diversity in the Divine of Life, of God Who reveals Himself in Christ. The Christological problematics, however, do no more than reveal the paradox of the Divine Life, that God is both the unity and diversity. And, in order to state clearly the principle of unity and diversity of God it has been necessary to bring out the data which Christology reveals, and use it for construing the Christian doctrine of God. But the data which Christology offers is not the whole data which New Testament Revelation offers us. Both the New Testament and subsequent sub-apostolic and patristic theology reveal that the Christian doctrine of God, together with Christology, involves its counterpart, pneumatology - namely the relationship (or differentiations) within divine life consist not only of the Father-Son relationships but of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Christological controversies which issued put the chief emphasis upon Christology. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit was always treated as an appendix to Christology. (1) It was remembered only to be mentioned sporadically, and at the Council of Nicea, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit seems to have been an afterthought/

(1) This is best illustrated from the works of Justin the Martyr where Christology completely dominates his thought.

/afterthought. Nevertheless, the Christian theologians perceived, as it appears, more by spiritual intuition than rational understanding, that the Christian doctrine of God involved a trinitarian rather than a unitarian conception of God.

This explains why the Christian trinitarian Baptismal formula is seldom lost sight of by the Christian writers of the Sub-apostolic and patristic period, as I have already pointed out earlier. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit seems to have created difficulties for the Christian theologians before the 14th Century, not because the reality of the Holy Spirit was doubted. On the contrary, the existence of the Church and the experience of the Christian believer affirmed it. But the theologians, dominated by the abstract and impersonalistic conception of God, seem to have been unable to see the place of the reality of the Holy Spirit in the eternal life of God (or as He is in Himself). The coming of the Holy Spirit into existence appeared to them to be prompted by God's action upon the world and His revelation therein, and to account for the reality of "the new being", which came into the existence since the Revelation of God in Christ. (1). We have seen this already/

(1) Here we have to do with what is usually called economic Trinity which as T. Rees puts it "conceived God as originally One, with the Logos and Wisdom immanent within Him, and the Logos became separate person for the purpose of Creation. The Logos is emphatically subordinated to the Father and the Spirit to the Logos. But the Spirit is still only the shadow of the Logos and it receives comparatively slight treatment". The Holy Spirit in thought and experience. P.126.

/already in Tertullian, and also in Origen whose teaching that the Holy Spirit is operative only amongst the saints while the Father and the Son participate in the whole of existence and directly in each other, reveals that Origen is not free from the same thought. This cosmological reason as Bulgakov calls it for the 'existence' of the Holy Spirit is present in the theology of Hypolytus. (1). And, of course, this way of thinking implies subordination of the Holy Spirit to Christ. This thought is present in Novation doctrine of Trinity: "...quoniam hec Paracletus acciperet nisi minor Christo esset si homo tantummodo Christus, a Paraclete Christus acciperet non a Christo Paracletus". Novation De Trinitate. 16. 24. (and also H.B. Swete: "The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church" P.108.). (2)

St. Athanasius, the champion of the Nicene Orthodoxy in which the doctrine of the homoousion of the Father and the Son was established by introducing the principle of omousion, /

-
- (1) H.B. Swete: "The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church" P.108.
 - (2) The teaching of Novation can not be supported by the New Testament which speaks of mutual subordination of Christ and the Holy Spirit, which, in other words, excluded any subordination. Novation argument is only a half-truth so far as the New Testament revelation is concerned.

/omousion, broke away from explaining the doctrine of God 'cosmologically'. But though he postulated the principle of the Trinity of God (1), he is unable to develop the doctrine of God from the Trinitarian standpoint. Rather, he first discusses the Father-Son relationship, and, on the analogy of this relationship, discusses the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit. "For the Holy and blessed Triad is indivisible and one in itself. When mention is made of the Father there is included also his word, and the Spirit who is in the Son, if the Son is named, the Father is in the Son, and the Spirit is not outside the Word ... The Spirit had not been divided from the Son, but was Himself in Christ as the Son is in the Father". (2) And again: "Son you observed that the Holy Spirit is named together with Christ? But when you did you find him distinguished in nature and separated from the Son, that, while you say that Christ is not a creature, you say that the Holy Spirit is a creature"? (3)

(1) Epistle to Serapion (Shapland translation P.63/64).

(2) Epistle to Serapion (Shapland translation P.93).

(3) Ibid: P. 80.

Athanasius develops the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in his letters to Serapion in which he is engaged in polemics with Tropici (1). The way St. Athanasius discusses the doctrine of God is unsatisfactory, for implicitly his treatment postulates two dyadic principles in the Divine Life: Father-Son; Son - the Holy Spirit (2).

Thus stated it is difficult to see how the Athanasian theology could escape the charge of subordinationism within the Triune life of God which it tries to denounce. The positive side in Athanasius' theology is that it inaugurated the classical doctrine of the Trinity of the Capadocian Fathers, which found its fullest expression in the amplified form of the Nicene Creed regarding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as promulgated by the Second Oecumenical Council at Constantinople/

-
- (1) These were people who taught that the Holy Spirit was a creature. On the meaning of the name and the problems involved in this discussion - footnote in C.R.B. Shapland's translation of the Letters of St. Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit, P.85.
- (2) Ibid. 1 Epistle to Serapion Par.20; V. also J.S.T. December, 1954. John McIntyre: "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought". "There is but one single set of relations involving Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and it is false abstraction to think of either the relation of the Spirit to the Son or that of Son to Father outside of that single set of relations which constitute the Divine ousia in energeia".

/Constantinople. A. D. 381. "We believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is together worshipped and together glorified, who spoke by the Prophets". (1) The important thing to notice here is that principle of omission of the Father and the Son, established at Nicea, has been explicitly resolved into including not only Father and the Son, but also the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Here the principle of the Co-eternity and co-equality of the divine persons (hypostasis) is established, thus freeing the doctrine of God from the necessity of explaining it by 'cosmological' reasons. God is fullness of being in Himself in the unity of His hypostatical life of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit; and as such, sufficient to Himself His hypostatical life, though manifested in the created world, is independent from it, and primarily concerns God in Himself rather than God in His relation to the world. This assertion in principle, of the autonomy of God from the world is the victory of the Christian conception of God as He reveals Himself in Christ over the Greek philosophical conception of Him, where He is pantheistically and impersonally conceived.

(1) W.A. Hammond; "Definitions of Faith" Oxford 1843.

The Doctrine of God in the Theology of the Cappadocian Fathers.

In the Cappadocian Fathers we find a consistently developed theology of personalistic monotheism of the Christian faith in contrast to the Jewish impersonalistic abstract monotheism. The nature of God and the mystery of His life, is understood by the Cappadocians as the revelation to God of His own Being, determined by the love of the Hypostases of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit for each other in such a way that the fullness and the autonomy of God is manifested through it. This personalistic monotheism in principle excludes any necessity in God and points out to His freedom which knows no limits except those of love, which cannot contain itself in itself, but in the joy of its fullness goes outside of itself, and from non-being creates being. Divine love calls the created being to participate with the freedom given to it by God, in the Divine love which is Divine freedom also. But while the Doctrine of God in the Cappadocian Fathers implies a right theological understanding of God in Christian revelation, the way in which they formulated the relationship of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, showing their oneness in diversity, presents as many problems as it solves. This was chiefly due to the difficulty inherent in the Christian Doctrine of God, namely that it lends itself to the suspicion of tritheism, when the abstract, 'unitarian', monotheism of/

/of Judaism is denied as being compatible with the Nature of God in Christian revelation. The Cappadocian Fathers were anxious to safeguard the trinity of God, in which His one-ness is manifested, from being thought of as tritheism. God is one ousia, say the Cappadocians, in three hypostases (persons), intellectual, perfect, individually subsisting, separate in number, but not separate in the Godhead. (Gregory of Nazianzus - Orations 33:16.).

The Cappadocian Fathers pointed out that Divine ousia, (the principle of Divine unity) and the Divine hypostases (the principle of the Divine diversity), are so correlated that they participate in each other. And since the Divine persons of Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not posterior to anything in the Divine life, other than themselves; the ousia, they said, must be inside one of the Divine hypostases. This hypostasis is the principle of Divine Unity of the whole Godhead, and is also a bearer of His hypostatical identity. For the Cappadocians, this hypostasis is God the Father, who is the cause (*aitia*) of the Son who is begotten from Him; and of the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father, through the Son. The Son and the Holy Spirit are brought forth from the Father (*aitaitoi*). (1)

Paul/

(1) On the teaching of the Cappadocians T.Rees, op.cit. P.150 ff.

/Paul Galtier in his book, "Le Saint Esprit en nous d'apres les peres grecs", explains this teaching aptly when he says: "There does not follow upon this any diversity in their activity, in their will or in their power. The only thing which is shown here is the manner in which the unity of the principle of action; which is their nature; is established in them. Coming entirely from the Father this principle is communicated entirely to the Son and through Him it finds, so to speak, its goal (end) in the Holy Spirit. The identity of their will and action is the necessary consequence of this. So, despite the distinction which results for them from this diversity, in the way in which they possess it (i.e. the principle of action) they are all equally the infinitely simple source of all gifts and of all blessings which are given to creatures". (1)

Criticism of the Doctrine of God in the Cappadocian Fathers.

This Doctrine of God has rightly been called 'the classic' for it sums up in itself the highest theological achievement in expressing the Christian Doctrine of God implied in New Testament/

(1) Ibid. P. 276.

/Testament revelation, using Greek philosophical categories in formulating it. But in spite of so much achievement in the formulation of the Doctrine by the Cappadocians, there were many inadequacies in it which had unhappy consequences for the Church. (1). The main deficiency of this doctrine was, that while it explained the immediacy of the relationship between the Father and the Son, it failed to give a satisfactory answer to the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Cappadocian Fathers were precluded from answering this question satisfactorily because they ascribed the ousia or the source of Godhead to the Father, and so were driven to postulate order (taxis) in the relationship of one hypostasis to the other. Thus the Father takes the first, the Son the second and the Holy Spirit the third place in this order. This order determines the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son. The principle of cause (aitia) and order (taxis) introduces in Divine life a necessity, which takes away the immediacy (i.e., freedom) of the participation of the Divine hypostases in each other. The essential error in the teaching of the Cappadocians was their inability/

-
- (1) In order to understand theologically the conflict between Eastern and Western Christianity, one must go back to the Doctrine of God as formulated by the Cappadocians.

/inability to see that the ousia must be thought of as belonging to all three hypostases rather than one. It is not only one person (1) in the Godhead which establishes the principle of unity as the bearer thereof, but all three simultaneously. It is not wrong to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, provided it is admitted that the Son is begotten from the Father through the Holy Spirit, for in this way the interdependence of the Divine persons and the mutuality of this interdependence is established. The Cappadocians' order (taxis) does not allow this, and their doctrine, in turn, implicitly denies the principle of equality which the principle of omousion contains. There is ground for the accusation which Father Bulgakov makes, that by the way in which the Cappadocian Fathers explain the unity of God, the three hypostatic Godhead becomes only Divine "It", but not three hypostatic "I" :- Divine Triuneness, because: "L'unité de la Sainte Trinité est établie non par la tri-hypostasie de la Personne Divine, qui comprend la trinité des Personnes equi-divines de nature unique, mais seulement par l'unité de cette nature". (2)

(1) I have been using the terms person and hypostasis interchangeably. / or only.

(2) S. Bulgakov: Le Paraclete, P.39.

The unsatisfactory manner in which the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was formulated by the Cappadocians is revealed in the eighth article of the Nicea-Constantinople Creed in which the teaching of the Church concerning the Holy Spirit is summed up. The great caution which is shown in this article clearly indicates the perplexity of the Church concerning the way in which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit should be formulated. The Fathers at this Council thought that the best possible way to avoid the controversy was to phrase this article as much as possible in the language of the Scriptures. Thus John 15.26., was made a central point. "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father". This answered only part of the question, but the equally important question in the whole problem of New Testament Revelation namely, that of the problem of the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit, was only vaguely indicated: 'the Holy Spirit is together with the Father and the Son worshipped and glorified'.

To the Christian East, which in matters of theology prefers the static and suggestive approach, the fact that the Son and the Holy Spirit share in the Father, the Son, by being begotten from Him, the Holy Spirit through procession, indicated sufficiently the unity and mutuality of the Son and the Holy Spirit; thus the East was not anxious to define this relationship more closely. Besides, the teaching that the Father was the whole source of the Godhead guaranteed the principle/

/principle of the Unity and the one-ness of God. When the West insisted on defining more closely the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Christian East went back to the Cappadocians and suggested that the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit is determined by the fact that He proceeds from the Father through the Son. (Greek "dia"). (1)

The Christian West remained unsatisfied with this compromise formula, which is indeed too weak to do full justice to Christian revelation where the mutuality of the Son and the Holy Spirit's relationship is revealed. The soteriological motives in the theology of the West (as for example, in St. Augustine) led the West to affirm the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit more concretely. The West introduced the principle of Filioque, and thus estranged the Christian East, which felt that the principle of unity in God was falsified by making two persons the principle of the third, i.e., two sources of Divine Being in/

-
- (1) H.B. Swete: - "The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church". P.252. Swete sums up the teaching of the Cappadocians thus: "The Father is the cause (aition). The Son and the Spirit are 'caused' (aitiaton), or from the cause.... the Son deriving His Substance immediately from the Father; the Spirit also deriving from the Father, but mediately through the Son. But these differences do not touch the essence; which is one and the same in all three hypostases". The idea of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son, is found in John of Damascus, in his "De Fide Orthodoxa" (vide T.Rees, op.cit. P.159).

in one Godhead. Thus the East took a defensive attitude on the Cappadocian Doctrine of God, while the Christian West became precluded, by the introduction of Filioque and commitment to it, from constructing a more positive Doctrine of God. The introduction of Filioque gave the death-blow to further development of the Christian Doctrine of God, because the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit had been made a source of contention. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit meant, in fact, to East and West, the Filioque controversy. Thus Christian theology has been impoverished, for this precluded the creation of a constructive theology of the Holy Spirit. The late Father S. Bulgakov has realised this fact fully when he says: "The Filioque dispute has destroyed all theological interest in the teaching about the Holy Ghost. The eighth article of the Nicene creed contains only the recognition of the divinity of the third hypostasis and its co-equality with the first two, and cannot by any means be regarded as an exhaustive dogma about the Holy Spirit... . The Filioque disputes having no spirit in them, actually proved an obstacle to true pneumatology Theological Christocentrism (arisen from it) ... lost the dogmatic and practical balance in the understanding of the Second and Third Hypostases, and it is precisely this balance that/

/that forms the essence of the dogma about the Church:

the Church is the Body of Christ, living by the Holy Spirit". (1)

-
- (1) L.A. Zander: "Vision and Action" P. 51. ff. (The truth of this statement is well illustrated by H. Watkins Jones: "The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church".

A RE-STATEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

A RE-STATEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD ready to

return to our main theme in this section - the construction of a Christian Doctrine of God, which is an attempt to free it from the impasse to which it has been brought in the past. We have seen earlier in this thesis, that New Testament revelation presents a paradox concerning the relationship of Jesus the Christ, (the Son of the Living God, as the New Testament confesses Him) and God His Father. The New Testament speaks of this relationship as consisting of the essential one-ness (unity) of the Father and the Son, and also that this one-ness does not annihilate their hypostases, but rather reveals them and affirms them. The Holy Spirit is implied in the revelation of the Father in the Son and Son in the Father, as the actuality of this revelation. The Holy Spirit does not abolish the paradox of unity and diversity in God of New Testament revelation, but reveals the meaning of this paradox. The Christian believer comprehends this paradox in the Divine life through the personalistic and dynamic character of Christian faith as the dialectic of God's love, whereby God, as Sergius Bulgakov puts it, - through the sacrifice and self-renunciation of the Father and the Son on each other's behalf, - reveals Himself in the Holy Spirit as the joy of this sacrifice - as its triumph - as the conquering love of God in an absolute sense. (1).

1. S. Bulgakov: "Utyeshitel" p.80 (Russian), vide Note at the end of this chapter.

The Nature of the Holy Spirit and the Nature of the Divine Life

The Holy Spirit in the New Testament and Christian experience is best understood in the words of Saint Paul, "God has revealed to us through the Spirit. For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God...no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God". (1 Cor 2-10:12). The Holy Spirit is the revelation of "the depths of God", experienced by the believer as God's act of self-surrender in love, (which is also the act of His revelation), to those who are grasped by Him. The inference from the Gospels is that this was certainly the experience of Jesus, in a unique and absolute sense. And also, according to the New Testament, the Holy Spirit is God in that aspect of His Being in which God comes to address man on His behalf, revealing to him the heart of God, where man, thus addressed, encounters the Divine Self of Christ revealing God in Himself and also human destiny. The Holy Spirit, in whom this revelation is actualised, bestows the reality of His own self-hood upon man thus grasped. The Holy Spirit reveals to the believer that the possibility and the meaning of human existence and its destiny, is only in and through his participation in God. The experience of being grasped by the Holy Spirit may be described also as standing in the presence of God. Here, the fellowship between God and man is realised and man becomes partaker in the revelation of God in Christ through whom only it is possible/

possible for a man to know God participating in his human existence, and he in God. Both of these acts reveal the Holy Spirit as their *raison d'être*.

The New Testament also speaks of the Spirit as God in the total sense of His Being. (Jn. 4.25). The meaning of the saying ascribed to Jesus by the Fourth Evangelist, must be taken that God is the self-contained Being who stands over against man, who is created by Him, and that the meaning and fulfilment of man's life lies in the acknowledgment of God in worshipping Him. This acknowledgment of God is unconditional for God reveals Himself as the Truth, - that about which there is no gainsaying, for truth carries its own authentication.⁽¹⁾

The quest for the understanding of the Christian doctrine of God must start with the question: What is the relationship of the Holy Spirit to God who is the Spirit? This question is not arbitrary but appropriate since the revelation of God to man is constituted in the Holy Spirit. Following on from what has been said concerning the Holy Spirit on the basis of the New Testament Revelation, the Holy Spirit must be thought of in relationship to the Godhead, as the hypostatical revelation of the spirituality of God to Himself. (By the Spirituality of God is meant His unique, self-contained Being.)

1. The fourth chapter of the Fourth Gospel expresses this thought explicitly when it speaks of Jesus the Christ in the encounter with a Samaritan woman, for she says, "He told me all that I ever did". John 4.39.

St. Paul's teaching that the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God, implies that since God is love, the revelation of the Holy Spirit is the revelation of the Divine love in relation to Itself, which means at the same time the revelation of the other to whom the love is directed. For love can only be revealed in the act when the other is present. The revelation of the Spirituality of God in the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, is the revelation of the Father through the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, who being the depth of the Divine love, outgoes from Himself and renounces Himself to the Father and on behalf of the Father in order to affirm the Godhead of the Father. The reality of the revelation of the Father to Himself, implies that He has received into Himself the Godhead revealed in the Holy Spirit. The revelation of the Godhead to the Father and in the Father consists in the act of renunciation of the Holy Spirit on behalf of the Father. The revelation of the hypostasis of the Father is the act of the reality of the self-renunciation in Love of the Holy Spirit on behalf of the Father. This constitutes the way towards the revelation and the recognition of God and by God of His own personality. I said "The way towards the recognition of personality" advisedly, for this is only the first moment in the revelation of personality which consists of the recognition of one's own self, in the act of receiving/

receiving love to one's self, from the other, who effaces himself on behalf of the one to whom love is offered. This moment occurs in the act of the self-renunciation of the Holy Spirit on behalf of the Father, and the Father's acceptance of this act of love. The second moment of the revelation of personality consists in the outgoing of the self which has received love, from itself toward the other, to reveal, by giving himself in love to the other, one's own participation in love. This means seeking not one's own affirmation but the affirmation of the other. This movement in God occurs simultaneously with the other and is characterised by the act of the Father outgoing from Himself and renouncing His own Godhead on behalf of the Son. This also will become clearer as our study of the Christian doctrine of God is developed further.

In connection with what has been said above with regard to the revelation of the Godhead of the Father, it is therefore right to speak of God the Father as the first Hypostasis, though not, of course, in the sense of the patristic theology which spoke of Him as being from Himself and therefore the First. No Hypostasis in the Divine Life is from Itself, nor is it right to speak of any Hypostasis as being merely from the other. The truth of the matter can only be expressed paradoxically. Each Hypostasis exists from Itself through/

through the other. This idea is implicit in the exposition of the Christian doctrine of God as presented in this thesis, and it is hoped that the argument of this thesis will justify the truth of this statement - THAT EACH HYPOSTASIS IS FROM ITSELF THROUGH THE OTHER, which is necessitated by the fact of mutuality, and therefore interdependence of the Divine Ousia, (Divine Unity) and the Divine Hypostases (the diversity in the Divine Life).

When the Holy Spirit reveals in His own Hypostasis the 'Spirituality' of God in the act of His self-renunciation on behalf of the Father, the Father outgoes from Himself to the Son, on behalf of whom He renounces the Godhead revealed in Him. In this act the hypostasis of the Son is revealed in the Father. By the Son's revelation in the Father, and the Father's in Him, the reality of the Godhead of the Father is confirmed. For this reality is 'unreal' (if we may say so), until it has found its confirmation in the Son. This follows from the nature of the Divine Life which is perfect Love, for if the Father in the act of receiving the revelation of the Godhead within Himself did not outgo to the Son, He would have demonised Divine Love, by usurping it all to Himself and thus destroying it. (1). (Love in the divine and the human/

1. I have been using categories of time and space to describe the Divine reality to which these categories are inapplicable. This is not illegitimate provided it is understood that I am here trying to translate in terms of human understanding, the dialectic of the Divine Life, where all the movement takes place simultaneously.

human sense means a sharing.) If the question is asked why does He need the Son to share the Divine Love with, (e.g. Godhead), when He could do that with the Holy Spirit, then at this stage it may be answered that the return of the Father in His renunciation on behalf of the Holy Spirit, would mean the negation of the revelation of Godhead in the Father. For if the diad in this instance falls upon itself instead of going beyond itself into a triad it becomes a monad and a monad is the negation of itself. This shows that the Bynitarian conception of God for Christianity, which conceives the nature of the Divine Life as love, is an abstraction and impossibility. The revelation of the Godhead in the Father through the Spirit is manifestation in itself of the fulness of being as the Pneuma, which is not as yet self-contained until in the Revelation of God the Father in the Son, the Godhead takes into Itself the "Meaning", (1) in which God comprehends Himself as His own ground of being and of all things created by Him.

In the act of the revelation of God the Father in the Son, which is actualised in the act of the Father's renunciation of Himself on behalf of the Son in whom the/

1. The word 'Meaning' is borrowed from Nicolas Berdyaev. The word 'meaning' is his rendering of the word 'Logos'. Thus he says that the first verse of the prologue of St. John should read 'In the beginning was the meaning'.

the Godhead reveals its meaning and comprehends itself; the Son does not usurp, (Greek - *arpazin*) the Godhead thus bestowed upon Him, but in response to the Love of the Father, asserts the Father as the principle of the Godhead, by His own act of self-renunciation to the Father. (1). In this is revealed what S. Bulgakov calls the tragic moment of the Divine Love which is the act of renunciation of the Father and the Son. In the act of renunciation of the Son on behalf of the Father, the renunciation in the Divine Life transfigures itself as the affirmation, by the nature of Divine Love, which finds its meaning in and through the self-sacrifice and renunciation. This affirmation manifests itself in the Hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, revealing the power of the whole Godhead as the triumph of Divine Love, as the affirmation of God by Himself, through the act of complete self-renunciation of three Divine Hypostases on each other's behalf. Also this affirmation is in and through the Holy Spirit, because in Him the first movement of the Hypostatical revelation of the Godhead, which is also the movement of the Divine love as self-renunciation, occurs. In the Holy Spirit, in His act of self-renunciation to the Father, as the Divine love, revealing the glory of the other, the subjectivity of the Divine Being/

1. The Father does not usurp the Godhead by keeping it to Himself possessively, and thus destroying it, but gives It to the Son.

Being is manifested. In the act of triumph of self-sacrificial Love of God and its transfiguration as the Divine self-affirmation, the Holy Spirit reveals in His Hypostasis the objectivity of Divine Being also. For the Father and the Son have not taken any other way in expressing Their Godhead, but that initiated by the Holy Spirit. In this They affirm the Holy Spirit, who thus reveals the Divine self-renunciation as Divine self-affirmation. In the E. Orthodox Church the Holy Spirit is rightly called "The Heavenly King", for in Him the self-sacrificial Love of God is revealed as the triumphant love - Divine subjectivity as the Divine objectivity of Being. (1). In Christian theology, however, the unity of Divine subjectivity/

-
1. What I have called the self-renunciation of God - or self-sacrificial Love of God, Paul Tillich calls the non-being in God. Thus in his book "Courage To Be", he says: "Non-being (that in God which makes his self-affirmation dynamic) opens up the Divine seclusion and reveals Him as power and love. Non-being makes God a living God. Without the No He has to overcome in Himself and in His creature, the Divine Yes to Himself would be lifeless. There would be no revelation of the ground of being, there would be no life." *ibid* p.170ff. I prefer to speak in this connection about the self-renunciation in God, self-sacrificial love of God i.e. self-giving love than non-being for the terms are more personalistic and they better describe the depth of being in personality than the non-being. For the same reason, elsewhere I have preferred to speak of *analogia amoris* than *analogia entis* in spite of the fact that Tillich's interpretation of *analogia entis* is attractive to me. (v. Tillich S. T. vol.one p.131,239ff.)

subjectivity and Divine objectivity is described rightly as expressed in and by the Father, for the Holy Spirit and the Son mutually glorify the Father. This is implied in the doctrine of the begetting of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. The Son and the Holy Spirit glorify each other by the Father and in the Father, hence their mutuality and interdependence. Thus the Divine Life is "the Kingdom of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit", - as the Eastern Liturgus expresses it - perfect unity in diversity, and the other way round, or to express it differently, God revealed in Christ is the perfect revelation of love abiding within Himself. This last moment in the Godhead is, as S. Bulgakov puts it, the triumph of self-revelation of God as the perfect Love, which overcomes tragedy in itself and manifests itself as beatitude.

In the preceding discussion we have come to the understanding of God as revealed to Himself from Himself in the following manner. Each hypostasis is the bearer in itself of the principle of the Godhead in which the revelation of the other two Hypostases and of Itself through the other two is actualised. When I have stated above that the Son is begotten from the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him I have stated correctly - provided it is also understood that in this act the Hypostasis of the Father not only affirms the Son and the Holy Spirit but is in turn affirmed/

affirmed by them. The Son reveals the Holy Spirit in the Father, abiding in the Father and being comprehended by Him. The Holy Spirit reveals in Himself the unity of the Father and the Son by His own procession of the Father and abiding upon the Son. (1). In this is also revealed the reality of the self-sacrifice (renunciation) of the Father and of the Son on each other's behalf, which means that in the Holy Spirit is hidden the Reality of Their Hypostases in as much as they reveal in them self-sacrificial nature of Divine Love. It is true that here is implied a kind of filioquism but not in the sense in which this doctrine is held in Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The Western doctrine of the Filioque with its 'utriusque ab uno principio' destroys the dynamic nature of the revelation of God within Himself as love and the diversity of the hypostases which arise from this, by merging two Divine Hypostases in one and condemning Divine life implicitly to a sub-personal existence.

The Relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit

Now we turn to deal with one of the most controversial problems in the Christian doctrine of God, namely the understanding of the relationship of the Son and of the Holy Spirit from the standpoint of the Trinitarian doctrine of God/

1. The fact that the Son in the act of Father's outgoing to Him does renounce Himself on the behalf of the Father reveals that the Holy Spirit, principle of self-sacrificial love in God, comprehends the Son. This is the abiding of the Holy Spirit upon the Son.

God in the Christian faith.

The revelation of the Son and the Holy Spirit in the light of the dialectic of the Divine Life as I have tried to explain it in this thesis, should, according to the inference from the Christian revelation, be understood as a movement within God towards the realisation of Himself, as the personal, active and creative selfhood, determined by and fulfilled in the communion of the three hypostases. This movement is initiated in the revelation of God of His own Godhead in the Hypostasis of the Holy Spirit; within this movement the self-revelation of all the three hypostases is revealed as the self-renunciation of each Divine Hypostasis on behalf of the others - from the Holy Spirit through the Father and exhausting and fulfilling itself in the Son. This movement of negation reveals its full meaning in the act of the Son's self-surrender to the Father where the self-denial of each Hypostasis, (of "no" to Itself for the sake of the "yes" to the other), on behalf of the other, is transfigured into the common "yes" of all three Hypostases the one to the other, and implicitly to Itself. This is what is meant when I state that each Divine Hypostasis is from Itself and through the other. The relationship of the Holy Spirit and the Son is determined by their revelation of each other through the Father. The first part of this relationship begins in the Holy Spirit's/

Spirit's "No" to Himself, which means ultimately the Holy Spirit's "Yes" to the Son. (It should be remembered that the Father outgoes to the Son, because of the presence in Him of the Holy Spirit.) In the Son's "No" to His own Hypostasis, in the act of His own self-renunciation on behalf of the Father, consists the Son's "Yes" to the Holy Spirit. This in turn means their common "Yes" to the Father. In the Father they comprehend each other and the Father. This is why the Son is begotten from the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him. The begetting of the Son by the Father is conditioned by the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the procession of the Holy Spirit by the begetting of the Son. In this act the Hypostasis of the Father reveals its own affirmation by the Son and the Holy Spirit through their subordination to Him. The Father, however, subordinates Himself to the Son and the Holy Spirit by revealing Himself through them and thus precludes Himself from manifesting His own Hypostasis to the world, except through and in the Son and the Holy Spirit. This is why the Father is the 'ontological ground' of the Godhead, for in Him the depth of Divine Love is hidden. From this the truth concerning relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit is made explicit. They are immanent to each other. The Son is the Meaning of the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit/

Spirit is the Life of the Son. This is why the Spirit abides upon the Son in Revelation and why the Son gives the Holy Spirit. (1). They are subordinate to each other and create such mutuality of each other's Hypostases that the understanding of Christ in the Revelation must be that His Being is Pneumatocentric and that of the Holy Spirit is Christocentric. They are Divine Dyad which could not turn into a monad and thus disappear, for the Unity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit implies the unity in God the Father as their ground of Being, who glorifies the Son by bestowing upon Him His own Godhead, (by letting the Holy Spirit abide on Him) and the Father also glorifies the Holy Spirit, (by giving to Him the meaning of the Godhead which is in the Son,) and the Son and the Holy Spirit, by glorifying and revealing each other, glorify and reveal the Father. (2). In our age, so far, the fuller grasp of this truth has not been possible, because our age, due to its lukewarm acceptance of Christ has been precluded from experiencing and sharing more deeply in the intensity of the Love and the Revelation of God of Himself to Himself/

1. "The Lord receiving this gift from the Father, gives it to those who are partakers in Himself, sending the Holy Spirit into all the earth." St. Irenaeus: Adv. Her. III: XVIII: 3.
2. St. Irenaeus calls Son and the Holy Spirit "Two Hands of God" v. "Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus" by John Lawson, p. 122ff.

Himself. However, unless the understanding of God in the Christian Revelation be formulated in the way I have been trying to explain the nature of God of Christian Revelation, the Christian believer will remain precluded from understanding the Revelation of God in Christ and His creation of Christian community as the way of God, whereby history is gathered into the Kingdom of God. In other words, the non-being in human existence is conquered by the manifestation in it of the nature of God who reveals Himself in human existence, a nature of Love which fulfils itself in finding itself in self-sacrifice on behalf of the other.

NOTE

The Theology of S. Bulgakov on the tragic (sacrificial) character of the Love of God and its counterpart the triumph of Love as the fulfilment through sacrifice, as the overcoming of tragedy shows one of the most profound insights into the paradox of the Divine Life (or as he calls it Antinomy, which he explains thus: "an antinomy simultaneously admits the truth of two contradictory logically incompatible but ontologically equally necessary assertions. An Antinomy testifies to the existence of a mystery beyond which the human reason cannot penetrate. This mystery nevertheless is actualised and lived in religious experience. All fundamental dogmatic definitions are of this nature". (Quoted from D.B. Baillie's "God was in Christ" P.108).

"Il y a cependant un caractère général qui est propre à l'amour en tant que tel et, par conséquent, à toutes les formes d'amour savoir le sacrifice dans le renoncement: car l'axiome de l'amour personnel, c'est qu'il n'y a pas d'amour sans sacrifice. Mais cette sacrificialité se réalise d'une façon triple dans la vie de la Sainte-Trinité. Le Père et Le Fils se renoncent. La relation entre Le Père et Le Fils, dans son aspect immédiat, est le côté tragique de l'amour, la dissonance divine de la souffrance sacrificielle, sans laquelle le sacrifice ne peut être réel et sans laquelle l'amour n'atteint pas toute sa réalité." Bulgakov asks whether it is possible to speak about the suffering in the life of God who is Absolute and all beatitude. He answers this question by saying "ne peut parler seulement de la souffrance dans la vie de Dieu, puisque cela serait évidemment incompatible avec la plénitude et l'absolu de cette dernière, et que cela signifierait une limitation. Néanmoins, on ne peut pas ne point parler de la souffrance sacrificielle, justement chez le Dieu Absolu comme d'un moment de la vie divine intratrinitaire, surmonte et résolu, telle une dissonance dans l'harmonie. On ne peut appauvrir cette dernière, dans la Divinité jusqu'à la réduire à un unisson plein d'ennui. La puissance invincible de la vie divine sa plénitude, son définies par cette victoire. L'amour dans la Saint-Trinité a besoin d'être d'une façon toute active extrême exhaustive, dans la reproche d'un sacrifice illimité"(1)

"But/

(1) S. Bulgakov. "Le Paracleté" (French translation) Constantine Andronikof, P.75. ff.

/"But love", says Bulgakov, "is not only sacrificial suffering - dying, self-renunciation, but Love is also joy, beatitude, and triumph. If the first axiom of Love says: there is no love without sacrifice, the second, and superior, which is also the last, consists in the fact that there is no love without joy and beatitude, and in general there is not any other beatitude except Love. Being tragic, Love is also overcoming of tragedy, and in this overcoming in fact the power of Love is concrete antinomy - sacrifice and finding of itself through sacrifice. And this beatitude of Love in the Holy Trinity is the comfort of the Paraclete The Holy Spirit as the hypostasis is the inner completion of sacrificial Love of the Father and the Son, as the joy of that sacrifice as its beatitude as the Love triumphant. (1).

Paul Florensky in his book "Stolp i utverjdenie istiny" (Moscow 1914), speaks also of the two movements within Divine Love. The first movement of Divine Love is its passing through self-giving, self-emptying of the Hypostases within Divine Life - their eternal renunciation and kenosis. The second movement determines Divine Life as the eternal re-establishment and strengthening of one Hypostasis by the other, in mutual glorification and majesty. Florensky thinks that the sacrificial side of the Divine Nature is more intimately experienced in our human existence. The time of full restoration for the creature has not yet come. (Rom. 8: 19-23). But in the triune life of God, which is above time, the triumphant element in Divine Love is ever-present, exalting the Beloved and glorifying Him; the giving of glory by one Hypostasis to the other. "The Son is glorified by the Spirit. The Father is glorified by the Son, or conversely, the Son is given the glory by the Father, and Only-begotten crowns with glory the Spirit; for with what shall the Father be exalted, if not with the true glory of the Only-begotten; and with what shall the Son be glorified if not by the majesty of the Spirit". Ibid.p.138.

In/

(1) S. Bulgakov: "Utyeshitelny" (Russian) P.80.

/In Eastern Orthodox theology, the Doctrine of the Trinity is central, for in this doctrine, the nature of God as Love is disclosed in a unique way, redeeming human existence and creating personality in man. Every other religion and philosophy falsifies the Divine Love and so is anti-personalistic. Inspired by this awareness Karsawin declares as the fact of the highest importance about Christianity, "Das Christentum ist nicht Pan-Theismus, nicht Dualismus, nicht Monotheismus, sondern die Religion des Dreieinign Gottes".

Vide. "Östliches Christentum Documente".
Vol.11. P.343.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

God in Himself and God in Revelation

In studies of the Christian doctrine of God it is customary to speak of the Immanent Trinity and the Economic Trinity. (1). These in other words are the Christian doctrine of God as He is in relation to Himself, and in His relation to the world. This division is false, should it imply that these two are played the one against the other. The nature of God's dealing with the world is determined by His inner life and not by an outside factor. The aseity of God is such that His Being does not allow any other factor to motivate His dealings with the world other than His own Being. God created the world because He is the fulness of Being which because of its perfection calls the non-being into the being. God bestows the creation with freedom because His own life is perfect Love, which is also perfect freedom. God redeems creation from sin which is egocentardness because in His own being the self-sacrificial Love continually succours the other. These qualities of God are ultimately understandable in terms of the Immanence in Him of the personal Selfhood revealed/

1. vide Claude Welsch: The Trinity in Contemporary Theology: S.C.M. Press, London 1953.

Dr. John McIntyre calls the Immanent Trinity Ontological Trinity: S.J.T. Dec. 1954, p.370.

revealed in the three Hypostases, expressing both the Unity of the Divine life because Neither of these Hypostases exists for Itself but for each other, nor do they merge into each other, for their diversity is maintained by the inner structure of their unity. They exist in unity because their being is prompted by love for the other and the same love which is the principle of their Unity necessitates their Diversity. The Ousia, (Principle of their Unity), and Hypostasis, (Principle of their Diversity), are immanent to each other. The paradox of the Divine Life is the paradox of God's Love. It is impossible to create an Immanent Trinity unless this is revealed by God Himself, as is the case with the Revelation of God in Christ. Nor is it possible to draw a meaningful doctrine of God as the Trinity in Revelation if this is not the expression of the very being of God in Himself. This problem is inseparable from the problem of the nature of the Revelation.

The revelation is not the Salvation if God is not wholly in His Revelation, as Professor Barth maintains. (1). If this is so, and I fully agree with Professor Barth, the/

-
1. Karl Barth: "The Doctrine of the Word of God; English translation, p.478. "Jesus Christ is therefore the real and the active Revealer of God... ..because in Him, His Son or Word, God sets and gives to be known not some thing... ..but Himself exactly as He knows Himself from eternity and in eternity".

the division on the Immanent and the Economic Trinity has no place in Christian theology. Statements such as those of T. Rees are meaningless: "The economic Trinity, like the Modalist, was a Trinity of Revelation. It had its significance in God's successive acts of creation, redemption and sanctification in human history". (1).

This argument is based upon a naive conception that Christianity teaches that God is three persons and therefore each person must do something different in the world to establish its own claim of Existence. (Thus, the Father creates, the Son redeems, the Holy Spirit sanctifies.)

From saint Augustine to Luther it was perceived that so far as God's relation to the world is concerned His "opera ad extra indivisa sunt, sic cultus Trinitatis indivisa est". (2)

The conception of God, however, as the Trinity reveals that He is a personal being and that His nature being personal, expresses itself in His three Hypostatic Selfhood, and that His personal Triune Being causes His revelation, and not the other way round. This brings us to a further stage in our study.

1. T. Rees, op. cit. 125.

2. Luther: Within the Godhead, (ad intra), the Persons must be distinguished and yet there are no three Gods but only one God ... I do not confound the Persons into one Person, but in the true Christian faith I retain three distinct Persons in the one divine eternal essence, even though these three persons in their relation to us and to the entire creation, (ad extra), are one God and creator ... This distinction may be too subtle and academic for us Germans and should be confined to the schools". Vide Francis Pieper Dogmatics I, p. 376.

2. THE PERSONALITY OF GOD

OR

THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

In the Christian revelation God encounters man as the Being who makes an Absolute Demand upon him and also as his final succour.(1). In other words, God reveals Himself as the Absolute Truth, that is, as He who only is, as He who recognises Himself through Himself, and therefore is the ground of His own being and of all things created by Him.(2). When God comes to man in revelation as the Absolute Demand, He does not come to man as One who stands merely outside human existence. God as the Absolute Demand means man's being (essentia) is being/

1. The categories of the Absolute Demand and the final succour, as applied to God in His revelation to man, are borrowed from Dr. H.H. Farmer, vide 'The World and God' p.93.
2. The idea of God as the Absolute Truth is taken from Paul Florensky's book, "The Pillar and the Ground of Truth", (Russian edition - Moscow 1914). In it Florensky discusses on philological grounds the meaning of the word 'truth'. Thus, for instance, the Russian word - 'istina' (estina) has its roots in the Russian 'est', i.e., 'is' (Greek: esti). 'Istina' means that which is ('aletheia). The word 'alethe(s)ia' or in Ionic form 'aletheia', and 'alethes' and 'aletheuo', is created by a privativum and 'lethos' (Doric: 'lathos') is of the same root as 'latho' (Ionic: 'letho') and 'lanthano' - meaning - to pass by, to remain unknown, to drop from remembrance. 'Aletheia' means that which is able to stand against the stream of oblivion. The truth is the eternal memory. Florensky carries this etymological study into Latin and Hebrew - 'veritas' and 'aemeth'. Florensky ibid p.15ff.

In another small work, entitled 'The Inaugural Address' ('Vstupitel'noe Slovo' - Sergiev-Posad, 1914), P. Florensky says "To acknowledge that truth makes itself Truth is the task of theodicy. This independence of Truth is expressed as investigation reveals, by the word homocousia - of the same reality (i.e. self-authenticating). In this way the dogma of the Trinity becomes the common ground of religion and philosophy, and in this dogma the perennial conflict between them is overcome".

recalled by man's existence (existentia). This reveals to man the spiritual depths of his being, and also the cleavage within himself which God only can overcome. Man's quest for his destiny is a quest for God also. God is the ground of man's existence, and through man's existence, God's demand is the demand of the Truth of man's existence, upon man's being, to be in accordance with the Ground of his being. In other words, man is recalled to recognize himself as himself, one whose independence from God is in fact non-being; he is re-called from the estrangement of his essentia and existentia from each other. To put it differently and in a more personalistic way, God recalls man to Himself in order that man may participate in God, and through Him overcome the non-being in himself. That is why God presents Himself to man as the Absolute Demand with such existential unavoidability and urgency. That is why His revelation to man takes the form of the Absolute Demand. In revealing Himself to man, God reveals His Absolute Selfhood, which in turn reveals to man relativity and the non-being within his own being. The Absolute Demand of God is the revelation of God as the Absolute Succour, who seeks to reveal His own Absolute being in man and save him from relativity and non-being.

In the revelation of Himself as the Absolute Succour, God reveals Himself as Absolute Love; namely God as the Absolute Truth reveals His own Aseity as Love. Man meets/

meets in the sufferings and the self-sacrifice of Christ the nature of God's Love as the Absolute Succour in the Christian revelation and as the seeking of man in his estrangement from God. Christ also reveals God's Love as the Absolute Succour of man, not only as self-sacrifice, but as the joy and triumph of God's love in the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. The revelation of God in Christ reveals that God's love is the Absolute Succour because it is an essential characteristic of God Himself, and through it, God as the Absolute Truth, expresses His own Being to Himself, for in Him, according to the Christian Revelation, the Father eternally realises His Selfhood, through His outgoing to the Son, (The Thou of the Father's "I"). This is an act of love whereby the Father by His outgoing to the Son, renounces His own Godhead on behalf of the Son. In this - the "I" and the "Thou" of the Father and the Son - God expresses His own Divine subjectivity, which resolves itself into the Divine Objectivity of the Divine He of the Holy Spirit.

The revelation of the Divine Objectivity within the Divine Subjectivity shows itself in the Act of the Father's outgoing to the Son, and the Son's own complete self-sacrifice to the Father, as an act of the Divine Love, which finds fulfilment and meaning in self-affirmation of the other/

other. In this act, Divine subjectivity because of the perfection and the fulness of the Love revealed in it as the self-sacrifice, reveals the reality of this sacrifice as Divine Objectivity. In the act of the return and self-sacrifice of the Son to the Father from the depths of God, the Holy Spirit is revealed, proceeding from the Father. In the Holy Spirit Divine Objectivity is revealed. The Holy Spirit, the He of the Godhead, is the revelation of the I and the Thou of the Father and the Son as the objective reality to each of them "individually" and both of them in relation to each other and for each other. This means that in the Holy Spirit the Father recognises His own Selfhood and that of the Son, not only subjectively but objectively. In the Holy Spirit, (if we are to use special terms which could only be applied metaphorically to God), the Father and the Son comprehend their own Immanence through the Transcendence of the Godhead, or rather the Depths of God in the Holy Spirit. The Divine I and Thou meet with, and in the Divine He of the Holy Spirit, in such a manner that it is more proper to speak of the Holy Spirit as the Divine "We". (1)

1. There is a fallacy which presupposes that the Divine We does not need for its realisation the I, Thou and He but only I and the Thou. The logic is that grammatically speaking, each I and the Thou are We. But it is forgotten that in the world of man, each I and Thou imply a He or a third. This third is the world which/

I have already explained that this Divine He or the Holy Spirit precedes I and Thou in the Godhead. Furthermore I have also spoken of how the Divine Objectivity revealed in the Holy Spirit is taken into the Divine Subjectivity of I and Thou of the Father and the Son, and how this Divine Objectivity realises Itself through Divine Subjectivity. It is not right, however, to ascribe Divine Subjectivity to the Father and the Son, and Divine Objectivity to the Holy Spirit; but it is right to postulate this subjectivity in the Divine I and Thou, and the Divine Objectivity in the Divine He or the Divine We. Each Divine Person contains within Itself both elements. For each Hypostasis enters in the constellation of Divine Subjectivity I and Thou or reveals Divine Objectivity, the He or We of God. The Divine Objectivity as revealed in the Holy Spirit cannot be spoken of as proceeding from the Divine Subjectivity of I and the Thou of the Father and the Son, as the Western Doctrine of the Filioque asserts, for the reason that in the act of procession, Divine Objectivity, though it is/

which surrounds them or God who is present to them as the ground of their destiny, if these I and Thou happened to be religious people. Without this third, the Human I and Thou would be in such a state of subjectivity that they would be to each other as appearances rather than as the reality. Their objectivity is hidden and revealed by the third. In regard to God this third or He must be inside Himself and identical with him, for God's He, unlike the third in the human world must be of the same nature as the I and Thou and immanent to them, otherwise God would be incomplete in Himself and only an unrealised potentiality and as such unable to create the world and reveal Himself.

is revealed in Divine Subjectivity, nevertheless remains within Divine Subjectivity and is not severed from it, and reveals this subjectivity as the Divine Objectivity. That is why it is right to speak of procession from the Father and not from the Father and the Son. The Father from Whom the Son is begotten and the Holy Spirit proceeds, is the expression of this unity and mutuality of the Divine Subjectivity and the Objectivity. The Western Filioque breaks this synthesis, for the Divine Subjectivity exteriorises from Itself the Divine Objectivity. This is an error for here the Divine Subjectivity transforms Itself into the Divine Objectivity and thus annihilates the reality of both. The Christian Doctrine of God containing the Filioque inside itself is always within the impossible situation, while attempting to relate Divine Unity, (Ousia, Substantia) and the Divine Diversity. (Personae Hypostases.) It has no choice other than the modalism of Threetheism, which explains why the Doctrine of the Trinity, one of the most important and fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith seems to have so little relevance to the actuality of the Christian life. This accounts for the shallowness of our theological immanentism and pragmatism and its ultimate weakness, because the ontological basis of this pragmatism and immanentism, is not understood. Hence the relevance and/

and importance in theology today for the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which is the key to the understanding of the Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity.

God is personality because He manifests His own Being as the Truth and Love, (the ground of human existence and its succour). The Truth and Love self-determine the Being of God as Himself. (1). The Personality is the power of self-determination from within, as Nicolas Berdyaev has rightly pointed out. (2). In the Christian revelation, God realises His own Truth or His own Existential in three Hypostases, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. (3). Thus, Divine Love through these relationships exhausts from within and absorbs within itself the Divine Ousia and determines it from within so that it reveals its own Aseity as Personality, which could/

1. Here it is not meant that the Truth and Love precede the Divine Being, but that God reveals the Truth and Love, and is Himself the Truth and Love.
2. Vide - 'Slavery and Freedom' p.26. The first chapter of the book deals with personality and is most interesting. It is significant that Berdyaev speaks of the grandeur of personality's power of self-determination, and adds, 'not even God can do it'. Ibid p.26. This is a vestige of Hegelian theogony in Berdyaev rather than the God of the Christian revelation. Otto Pieper in his book 'God and History', p.xviii, has criticised Berdyaev by stating that his Doctrine of God belongs to the Hegelian rather than the Christian view. This criticism may also apply to Paul Tillich.
- 3./

could have no place within itself for more relationships.

Paul Florensky, in the book already mentioned, asks the question, "Why are there only three hypostases, you may ask me?" "I speak," he says, "of the number 'three' as immanent in Truth, inwardly inseparable from it". (4). According to Florensky, it is impossible to have less than three, for only three hypostases eternally confirm upon each other, that which they are from eternity. Only in the unity of the three does each Hypostasis receive absolute reality which consolidates it as such. Outside the three, there is no subject of the truth. Florensky further asks if it is possible to have more than three. He answers positively. It is possible to bring into the Divine Life/

-
3. The term - existence (existentia) when applied to God, needs clarification. This term is a space-time category which describes man's experience of himself in the world. Man experiences his being as existing alongside other beings. This is possible for him because of his participation in existence which precedes him. Neither of these two are applicable to God for He does not exist alongside any other being, or is preceded by anything prior to Him. He is the ground of all existence, and as such existence *sui generis*. Yet the term 'Divine Existence' is better than any other to describe the living and self-revealing God of Christian faith. For in one sense, God only truly exists, because He 'experiences' His being as wholly 'inside' and 'outside' Himself. The unity of Divine Subjectivity and Objectivity. Therefore, the term 'existence' applied to God, with these qualifications, is not only legitimate, but most relevant.
4. *ibid.* p.50. Vide also the German translation in 'Östliches Christentum' vol.II p.36.

Life of the Trinity, new members, but these new hypostases are not, in fact, members upon whom the subject of Truth is dependent, and therefore they are not manifested as an inner necessity, for its absoluteness. These are conditioned hypostases which can either be or not. Therefore it is not right to call them hypostases in the strict sense, but better to call them 'divinised persons'. (1).

1. Florensky, *ibid.* p.50.

THE MEANING OF PERSONALITYPersonality, Divine and Human

In the light of what has been said above, we are able to define the meaning of the much used, and misused concept - personality, looking at it from the standpoint of Christian theology. Here personality is an entity in which object and subject co-exist in mutual dependence. This constitutes the self-consciousness of personality, and the depth of this consciousness is proportionate to the measure of the unity of object and subject. In God this must be thought of as being Absolute. (This is expressed in classical theology in terms of the Doctrine of the Logos, namely that from God the Father is begotten the Second Person, the Son of the Father.) From this arises the definition of person made by Boetius as "naturae rationalis individua substantia", (the individual substance of a rational nature) and it is this concept which underlies our contemporary thinking on the subject of personality. (1).

But the essential structure of personality is not its rationality, but its realisation and fulfilment in Love which means its outgoing from itself and finding itself/

1. vide L. Hodgson: The Doctrine of the Trinity, p.159. vide also Dom Mark Pontifex op. cit. p.18. "The definition of person given by Boetius was accepted by St. Thomas: 'an individual substance of rational nature' St. Thomas added slightly to this definition by explaining that a rational substance is master of its own act and acts of itself, and that person implies all this". Summa Theol. I.Ch.XXIX art.1.

itself through the other. This renunciation on behalf of the other through which personality realises itself, liberates the personality from the danger of destruction by "egoism", for personality is the affirmation of the other and of itself through the other. Therefore a communion of Love is essential to the structure of personality. Where Love is absent in this sense, personality is also absent though individuality may appear to be pronounced in the individual human being. (1). This is why the concept of personality is meaningful only inside the world of Christian revelation. Personality is the realisation of the individual, (given to man as his reality and possibility), through God who is the ground of man's existence. This is achieved through the relationship of God and man, and the relationship is meaningful only when expressed through love. Thus the creation of personality in the world is the manifestation in the world of the Kingdom of God, as the Love which creates personality is the revelation of God's love by which His own being is revealed as Himself. God reveals His own Love because God's love is utter succour, even to the extent of/

-
1. vide Berdyaev: "Slavery and Freedom", p.37, where Berdyaev explains that 'individuality denotes the unique within its kind, the original, distinguished from any other and from the rest'. According to him 'personality enhances this uniqueness and originality of individuality rather than annihilates it ... Personality has a higher degree of individuality than the individual'.

of its outflowing into the non-being which manifests itself in the act of creation ex nihilo. Because the creation is brought into being by the Love of God, God's love bestows freedom upon it, for Love is freedom. Under the conditions of human existence, created freedom loses its understanding of its true nature and also its heterocentricity, and becomes egocentric and thus turns into sin and becomes slavery. God's Love succours and restores the enslaved freedom of man by revelation of God in human existence as a man, in Jesus the Christ. In this the works of Saint Irenaeus and the book "Incarnation of the Word of God" by Saint Athanasius are invaluable in bringing out the connection between the creation of man and the world and the Incarnation of the Word in Jesus Christ. The revelation of God in Christ, (being the Revelation of God's Love), is the revelation of personality. Personality is the gathering into oneself through love, the whole creation and embracing it. This personality does not for its own, but for God's sake, whose Love revealed in Christ has called personality into existence. Personality is therefore God-centred. Personality in the Christian sense is unthinkable without God who is Love. In this lies the difference between Divine and human personality. Human personality is derivative and is always, at least in this world, a potentiality/

potentiality, for in it Love's heterocentricity, and therefore also its self-centeredness, are never fully realised to such a degree not to be threatened by the non-being. God's personality is self-centred for in it occurs absolute hypostatic union of the I and Thou in Love. (1) Here lies the answer to those who imagine that man is personality in a full sense, and who speak of God as supra-personal, to make a distinction between man and God. (2). God is never beyond personality, but man is below it and even if man's personality is fully realised, this does not mean that man is equal to God, for man's personality is the creation of God's grace, (God's love). God's personality is from Itself and by Itself. This does not mean that man's personality does not contain a real freedom in Itself, for indeed it does. This freedom gives experience of independence to human personality over nature, and also/

-
1. The actuality of self-centeredness in Divine Personality is achieved through the dialectic of personal love, which renounces its egocentricity in order to become heterocentric. In reaching heterocentricity Divine Love unites the I and Thou in God which seek a common centre of Divine Being to lean upon and be supported by it. This is the Divine Hypostasis to which both the I and Thou renounce Themselves and which supports them and is upheld by them. This Divine centre is the Divine We. Thus the self-centredness of the Divine Personality is the creation of three-hypostatic Love of God revealed in and upheld by the unity of the I, Thou and We of the Divine Being.
 2. P. Tillich, *ibid* p.156: "For that which is the ultimate concern of person cannot be less than a person, although it can be and must be more than personality"
Vide also C.C.J. Webb, "God and Personality", (1918)p.128.

also in relation to God. But man cannot use his freedom against God, for in that moment his freedom turns to slavery. This in turn reveals the meaning of the concept of freedom in Christian theology which does not conceive of freedom in terms of the naive notion that freedom means being free to choose God or reject Him. The freedom is choice for God. The rejection of God is no more freedom, but slavery and self-destruction. This reveals the theocentricity of freedom for as such, it cannot be against God. Freedom is the act of Divine Love, whereby man is enabled to realise his own personality in accordance with the possibility which God reveals for man and bestows upon him by the Holy Spirit in whom Divine Love revealed in Christ is given to him. Personality is the expression of man's participation in God's love. It is the mirroring of God in human existence. The destiny of personality is sainthood. (1).

Personality is not a nominalistic category. Personality is not Law but Grace. It moves on a different level/

-
1. "The term 'saint' has been misunderstood and distorted; saintliness has been identified with religious and moral perfection But Sainthood is not a personal perfection. Saints are persons who are transparent for the ground of being which is revealed through them and who are able to enter a revelatory constellation as mediums. Their being may be a sign-event for others. This is the truth behind the Catholic practice of demanding miracles from every saint." P. Tillich: Systematic Theology, I p.121.

level from legalism. The relation of personality to Law (Nomos), is expressed in a paradoxical saying of Saint Augustine: "Love God and do what you will". (1). This is not antinomianism as is often thought. It is the conquest of freedom in personality over the necessity in human existence. (Law is necessity and not freedom.) Personality is the revelation of the Spirit. The meaning of personality from the standpoint of Christian theology is best understood through the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

This doctrine reveals that the human personality exists by the love of the Divine Personality. Divine Personality constantly creates human personality. God places human freedom in complete independence of Divine Freedom. Personality means the acceptance of created freedom and coming to God in freedom. Nikolas Berdyaev, who greatly exalts the dignity of man which God bestows upon him, has failed to understand the meaning of human freedom as a creation of God's love which God allows to stand over against Him. Berdyaev was unable to understand that God could create such freedom and bestow it upon man because he failed to perceive that this is implied in Divine Life in which absolute diversity co-exists with absolute/

1. 'Dilige, et fac quod vis' Ep. Jo. ad. Par., VII.8.
quoted by T.E. Jessop "Law and Love".

absolute unity. Berdyaev postulated the ground of human freedom in Ungrund, the aeonic world, which is a Platonic idea and alien to Christian thought. Berdyaev has failed to understand the meaning of God's love and its heterocentric nature. It can only be understood fully in terms of the Christian doctrine of God based upon an interpretation of Christology through Pneumatology, and Pneumatology through Christology. Berdyaev was precluded from doing this for his doctrine of God is more philosophical than Biblical, or rather an uneasy compromise of the two, present in the theology of the Greek fathers. Personality is the realisation of the Image of God in which man was created. This image, since it is the expression of Divine Love, is three-hypostatic. The Christian Baptismal formula "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit" when properly understood, reveals the mystery of the New Creation in Christ, which is hidden in the depths of God's love. This is why Baptism has been looked on as an important event. Baptism confirms the birth of personality. Christian Baptism loses all depth where the understanding of the Trinitarian Conception of God is absent. The same is true of the Sacrament of Eucharist. The Eucharist is a manifestation of the existence of personality or the continuation of what Baptism has/

has declared. In Western theology, both Roman and Protestant, the meaning of the Personality of God cannot be fully disclosed until/unless Divine Christocentricity is (not) re-interpreted by the Divine Pneumatocentricity, and both of these, by the Divine Theocentricity which is in God the Father. This is a hopeless task for any theologian who builds up the doctrine of God on the doctrine of Filioque, for this doctrine precludes the possibility of such a theology. It destroys the reality of the Dialectic of the Divine life, and interprets the self-renunciation of every Divine Hypothesis on the others' behalf as merging the one into the other. Modalism is a logical kind of Trinitarian doctrine based on a doctrine of Filioque or subordinationism as is seen in Emil Brunner's conception of the Divine Hypostases as *Hintereinander* (1) and not *Nebeneinander*. Both of these destroy the meaning of God as Personality, for the simple reason that both falsify the meaning of the heterocentricity of God's love. In Modalism this heterocentricity completely disappears, for the reality of the Divine Hypostases, (or Divine Diversity) is being destroyed for the sake of Divine Egocentricity, which devours the other instead of/

1. vide C. Welsh, *ibid* p.67.

of affirming him in love. (1). Thus both the subjectivity and objectivity of the Divine Being are destroyed. (One cannot exist without the other as this is the nature of God's love.) In the case of the subordination, the heterocentricity is destroyed by being explained as a necessity, for freedom is taken from it. Order is the presence of necessity which destroys freedom. (2).

Subordination is a doctrine of God not based on the principle of God's Love, and as such precludes an interpretation of God as personality in a most meaningful and personalistic sense, a sense worthy of dealing with problems implied in the Christian revelation.

Personality is the community of Love. God's personality contains within Itself both the principle and the reality of this community. In this, God's personality and man's personality differ. Man's personality contains within itself only the possibility of this community of love. Its realisation is not through itself, but through the other who is always outside the individual called to be a person, whether the other be another man or God.

Here lies the error of Saint Augustine's psychological/

-
1. such God is Deitas of philosophers, but not God of Christian Revelation.
 2. Paul Florensky, *ibid* 50, "in Absolute Threecunity there is no 'order' and there is no sequence. In the three Hypostases each is directly side by side with the others and the relationship of the two can only be mediated by the third".

psychological interpretation of the Trinity as the unity of mind, knowledge and will (memoria, intelligentia, voluntas). Saint Augustine's 'trinitarian' concept of man's rational life implies that man's individuality is theonomous. This can only be said about personality. The relevance of the Divine Trinity of God to human existence is to open up the individuality of man so that it may cease to be egocentric and become heterocentric. (1) On this point the theology of St. Augustine is in need of criticism and correction. His greatest contribution to the Christian doctrine of God has been the conception of God as love, which implies Lover, Beloved and Love Itself. (2) And yet he explains the likeness of the Divine and human personality in terms of the mind and not of Love. Man is the image of God, not according to all the things pertaining to his nature, but according to his mind alone. (De Trinitate XV.7). (3). But the determinative factor in this situation is not mind but love, which creates both Divine and human personality. Love informs the relationship of God and man, and is the image of God in man./

1. That he may transform individuality into personality.

2. vide H.B. Swete: "The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church", p.330.

3. "homo qui non secundum omnia quae ad naturam pertinent ejus, sed secundum solam mentem imago Dei dicitur, una persona est, et imago est Trinitatis in mente."

man. With God, personality is an ever-abiding Reality, but for man it is, since he is a creature, a task of his destiny. Man achieves personality by going out from himself to the other. The other reveals the truth of human existence which is the state of dependence upon the other. The other in relation to man is another human being. The otherness of the other, even where real fellowship is established, does not give full 'rest' to personality unless this I and Thou are both grasped by God, who reveals the depth and the meaning of heterocentricity through which the personality finds its own self-centredness. If God is not revealed in the movement of personality in finding itself through the other, as He in whom I and Thou through which personality moves, personality remains in the sphere of subjectivity and unresolved tension. (1). St. Augustine's psychological analogy of the Trinity may satisfy conceptual but not personalistic thinking. (2). Love, however, is immanent in personalistic thinking and drives the individual from itself to become transformed into personality. When personality/

1. This is the situation of the tragedy of Tristan and Isolde - the tragedy of possessive love. This danger is very real in marriage. The Christian marriage redeems this situation by the commitment of I and Thou to the He of God and each finding the other in Him.
2. vide K. Barth: "Doctrine of the word of God": Vestigum Trinitas 383ff.

personality finds its own rest through I and Thou in the He of God, the He of God reveals Its own mystery. God reveals His own Personality, grounded in His own Trinity. Because the Divine Personality is Triune, God is able to establish the freedom of and give ground in Himself to the human personality. Man's personality does not reveal the image of the Trinity in itself as St. Augustine thought. The image of the Trinity is only revealed in the reality of the Divine Trinity - (this is in the Christian Revelation alone and nowhere else). (1).

Augustinian thought has induced many Christians to accept the Hegelian image of Trinity-in-Thought. The acceptance of any Image of the Trinity outside God is a depersonalisation of God and ultimately of man. The Image of the Trinity in St. Augustine depersonalises man for, if the Image of the Trinity is present in man, he has no need to go outside himself to achieve his own personality, and has no need to ground his personality in God; he is self-sufficient; he is, in fact, God. Here conceptual thinking reveals its own limitations for dealing with the realities of faith. (2). Its logic destroys the structure of the experience which is always personalistic, as was the case with Augustine. The immanence of the Image of the Trinity in man as thought by St. Augustine is/

1. vide Appendix II.

2. vide Appendix dealing with Dorothy Sayers' "The Mind of the Maker".

is contradictory to his theology of the Divine grace.

Personalistic thinking unites thought and experience. It is only this thinking that can appreciate and grasp the meaning of the Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity as the chief doctrine of Christian Revelation. The understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity in this way reveals that the devotional and the theological life of the believer are organically united. He comprehends the doctrine and worship as the unity. The Eastern Orthodoxy, in my experience, expresses this to a degree not present in Christianity elsewhere. This is also the reason why the Eastern Orthodox Church cannot understand the tensions inside the Protestant theological world, which are created by the need for this synthesis. The work of the Protestant theologians is frustrated precisely because of the formalistic character of Protestant worship which is not able to express liturgically the Christian doctrine to the degree to which it should be expressed. This in turn vitiates the Christian doctrine which moves in an orbit of conceptual thinking. There are signs of an improvement in this situation due to the two movements: Faith and Order, and Life and Work. The tragedy is that the organic unity of these four is being split into life and/

and work, and faith and order, and these two groups are opposed the one against the other. Thus faith and work, life and order are divorced, the one from the other, and so theologically reveal the greatest tragedy in Christian theology, namely that of the split between the Pneuma and the Logos which has arisen from the separation between Christology and Pneumatology. In the unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, the Christian Revelation expresses the demand for unity of every Objective element in Christian faith to its Subjective counterpart. This is implied in the personalistic nature of Christian Revelation, which is the Revelation of the Personality of God. Those who cannot conceive the Christian Revelation both Christologically and Pneumatologically simultaneously, are embarrassed by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. At the best, they falsify its meaning by describing it in conceptual forms. There is more truth in some crude anthropomorphic realism as applied to the Christian faith than in conceptual thinking. Both are in fact impersonalistic; one puts preponderance on objectivity, (anthropomorphic realism - Biblical fundamentalists), and the other upon subjectivity, (conceptual thinking - R. Bultmann and Paul Tillich). These are both heresies from the Christian standpoint, for Christianity only knows the unity of Object and Subject./

Subject. (i.e. I and Thou in the He or We). The person of Christ reveals this Unity in Himself, that is why He is the Saviour. This unity exists in God but not on earth. Hence the falsity of Adoptionist Christology which implies that Subject and Object unity (Father - Son) does not precede the Creation which to them (i.e. the unity of the Father and the Son) is a moment in the Divine existence which was not also the beginning. This makes havoc of the understanding of God, who creates, and God who reveals Himself in Christ. Adoptionism is an unrealistic compromise between the Jewish and the Christian conception of God and, as such, a very unreal meeting place for both religions. It had some justification at the beginning of Christianity while it was still early for the Christian Revelation to assert its own independence from Judaism. It is indeed most amazing that as early as the writing of the New Testament, (especially St. Paul), the independence of the Christian Doctrine had taken such shape as it had.

In saying previously that personality is three hypostatic I meant that God creates personality in the world because of His three-hypostatic nature. This term/

term, "three-hypostatic creation", in regard to personality, may also be applied in another sense. I have said how the self-centredness of personality is realised through the sacrifice of egocentricity for heterocentricity, and how these two acquire objectivity in the He-ness of the Third. For the Absolute destiny of personality this He must be God. In the third, Subjectivity of the I and Thou unites itself to the Objectivity in personality revealed in the third, and at the same time the third who reveals the Objectivity of the personality, becomes also the Subjectivity of the personality. But the third, though He reveals the objective side of personality, does not annihilate the subjectivity of personality, which in some ways sacrifices itself to the third, but only grounds it in Himself, thus establishing the self-centricity of the personality. This self-centredness is not egocentricity but the revelation of the true nature of personality as a Love which is truly self because of the Love which I has for Thou and both of these for the He of God. If the third, the He, happens not to be God, but the world, there is also the possibility of meeting in this third. Here the Subjectivity of personality may be united with the Objectivity - the It of the world. Two human beings/

beings which are I and the Thou to each other could be both lovers of music or anything else in which they both share, and through which their personalities acquire Objectivity. The dreadful thing which happens here, however, is that this Objectivity enslaves the Subjectivity of personality and idolatry is created. This is a lure of slavery. It is here that false transcendence usurps the search for the fulfilment of personality in a Divine transcendence. This reveals the ambiguity inside the Arts, Science and Religious Cults. These may indeed reveal Divine transcendence and sometimes be a substitute for it. The latter situation is responsible for the conflict of what is called prophetic religion and priestly religion. The cost which prophetic religion has to pay in denouncing the immediate as idolatry is the creation of difficult situations for personality. God is not He to both I and Thou, or Thou to I and Thou. He is directly Thou to the I only, but not both the I and the Thou. (1). When the human ego posits God as Thou in this way, the human divine relationship remains in the sphere of Subjectivity. This creates great fanaticism. Here/

1. In this respect the Epistle of St. John 4.20 is right: If anyone says, "I love God" and hates his brother, he is a liar, for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen cannot love God whom he has not seen. See also Matt. 18.20. "For where one or two are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them."

Here personality finds no rest. It suffers from religious neurosis. This was partly present in Kierkegaard, (1) as a revolt against the identification of the He of God with the It of the world, (the worldliness of the Church of his time). (2). God is present as the rest of personality only where God is revealed as the Thou from within the relationship of I and the Thou who both belong to the world. The Thou may be the world itself or another person in the world. When God reveals Himself as a Thou from within this relationship, His Thou bears Objectivity. God is really both He, who gathers I and Thou into Himself, not to annihilate them but to integrate them, the one into the other. His He, in fact, is the Objective We of I and Thou. In other words, He posits/

1. Martin Buber, during his visit to Trinity College, Glasgow, was asked about Buber's criticism of Kierkegaard in breaking the engagement with Regina Olsen. The question was put in this form. Why was Kierkegaard wrong if he did this thinking that God wanted Kierkegaard's loyalty and service to the exclusion of everything else. (Kierkegaard explained his own situation as being comparable to Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac.) Buber said, "God does not want us to approach Him thus," and he lifted his hands vertically, (sort of egoism a deux), "but thus" and he formed his hands as in an embrace. What amazes me still in remembering this incident is that if God as the Jews understand Him is 'individual' rather than personality, there are no reasons why to Him this egoism a deux is not accepted, while it is completely right to speak from the Christian standpoint in no other way of understanding our relationship to God but as Buber has indicated.
2. Also in early Barth, expressed in his *sank von oben*.

posits I and the Thou as His Thou, but not in the Hegelian sense. God's Thou in this sense is Thou of adoption through His Absolute Thou, God's Christ and the Holy Spirit. I have expounded this problem from the standpoint of the New Testament statement when I have spoken of the problem: The Holy Spirit and the believer in connection with Pauline Theology. (1).

At this point some discussion seems necessary regarding the nature of the now prevalent consideration in religious philosophical thinking on the category of I and the Thou. Martin Buber in his book bearing the title "I and the Thou", has rendered a great service to/

1. Paul Florensky, *ibid* Russian p.75.: God who knows me as His creation loves me through the Son, as His image, (imago); as His own son. He rejoices in me in the Holy Spirit as his 'likeness' (similitudo). He actively knows, loves and rejoices with me, for I am given to Him. God reveals Himself as the source of knowledge, Love and Joy. But my knowledge of God, my love towards God, my joy in regard to God are passive because God is given to me partially. (This is because of the relativity of Love in man. God is absolute Love and is known fully through the Absolute Love - bracketed comment mine.) And maybe that He gives Himself to me in measure of my likeness to Him. The likeness to God's love is active love for Him who has already given Himself to me. Why Love in fact is neither knowledge nor joy? Because Love is a substantial act which passes from subject upon object and having reliance on the object - while knowledge and joy are directed towards the subject and in it is the point of application of their power. God's Love passes from Him to us but the knowledge and contemplating joy abides in Him. Therefore the person of the Father and the Holy Spirit was not incarnate, but Son - the Word, hypostatical Divine Love."

to personalistic thinking by formulating this category in which is revealed the depth of Subjectivity in personality and personality as Love. But, as has been made plain above, the I and Thou relationship is only the first movement in the revelation of personality. It is not fully personal, as only the Subjective part of personality is present in it. It is on this point that Raymond George errs when he says: "Similarly we should speak of I - Thou relationship, for they are the highest that we know and indeed are simple personal relationships" (1) In the world of the Christian Revelation this is only half a truth for the "I and Thou" relationship is not sufficient to describe the revelation of the God of Christian religion as R. George implies. (2). Here, in fact, we move in the sphere of Byniterianism which dominates the Christian doctrine of God in many quarters of Christian theology. There is nothing to choose between the Unitarian and the byniterian doctrine of God.

In Unitarianism God is not Personality - the unity of the subject-object. He is an object. Some Unitarian theologians even falsely think that God is subject also/

1. Raymond George, *ibid* p. 249.

2. "We must not go so far as to make their relationship, (of the Persons in the Trinity - brackets mine), to each other seem less vivid and real than those personal I-Thou relationships which are the most vivid of all realities to us." *ibid* p.

also. And that this subject, or maybe object, or as Tillich puts it - "God is beyond subject-object relationship" (1), is capable of establishing the I and the Thou relationship where God is I to another entity outside Himself, while He remains an unidentified monad. In this lies the error of Martin Buber's view. The spirituality in the book "I and the Thou" implies either pantheistic Hegelian philosophy or Christian revelation. On the basis of Jewish Unitarian faith his book is not intelligible. Christian Byniterianism falsely assumes that the I and Thou relationship in God establishes subject-object relationship in God; on the assumption of this false conclusion they state that the third "the He or We" is superfluous.

But this is not so. The I and the Thou are polarities of the subject, and are not subject-object relationship, but movement within subject. The thesis and antithesis reveal the process of personality becoming self-centred, but this process is made complete only in the meeting of the I and the Thou in the third, the He (or We), revealing this "He" from within itself and revealing I and the Thou in the He. Here the dialectic/

1. vide Appendix II.

dialectic process of personality is accomplished in the synthesis of these three. Here the personality acquires its self-determination in having in itself the subject-object relationship.

Bynitarian God is not God who is, but God who becomes. For some Christians this becoming of God is fulfilled in the Bible or the Church, or 'personal experience'. God-manhood here is conceived not as Divine Grace but as Divine necessity. In this Christology, P. Tillich reveals philosophical Hegelian structures rather than those of Christian revelation.

In some ways the Unitarian conception of God is preferable to the Bynitarian. The Unitarian God has at least a potentiality of realising His Being from within Himself. Though the kind of Unity of God which Unitarianism ascribes to God depersonalises God, nevertheless the Unitarian conception of God may inspire a religion of impersonalistic mysticism or moralistic legalism. These two are polarities, having a common origin. Unitarianism may contain depths of religious feeling within itself. In Bynitarianism the Divine potentiality present in Unitarianism is destroyed and the 'realisation' of God as Personality cannot be achieved. In Bynitarianism both the Unity and the Diversity in God are destroyed/

destroyed because of the incompleteness of the latter. A theology can be built upon it but its categories are of conceptual and never personalistic thinking. The School of British Liberal Theology tended to the Bynitarian conception of God, while European liberal theology was essentially Unitarian. Owing to this difference, European Theological Liberalism was an invasion of philosophy in Christian religion. It was a compromise of Christian religion and philosophy. British Liberalism leaned towards science and was a compromise of Christian religion and science. (1). Paul Tillich's theology combines the traditions of European and British liberalism. (2). That is why his theology speaks to both the philosophical and scientific minds of our ages.

European theology as represented by Rudolf Bultmann, desires to re-establish the synthesis between theology and philosophy as represented by existentialism, though some existentialist philosophers, such as K. Jaspers, are not prepared to accept this alliance. (3). This is seen from K. Jaspers's participation in the discussion/

1. vide L. W. Grensted: "The Changing Background of Theological Studies", reprinted from Bulletin of the John Rylands library, Vol.37, No.1. Sept. 1954.
2. vide on the Filioque: C. E. Raven: "The Creator Spirit", p.5ff.
3. K. Jaspers: "Die Frage der Entmythologisierung" Munchen, 1954.

discussion inaugurated by Bultmann on 'Kerygma and Mythos' and Jaspers' admiration for Karl Barth, who opposes this synthesis on theological grounds also. In Britain the school of logical positivism is questioning the very possibility of rapprochement between science and religion. This reveals the crisis within Christian Unitarianism and Bynitarianism. In Christian Bynitarianism the second Person of the Godhead is sometimes Logos, sometimes Pneuma. This reveals the difficulty in understanding the British Liberal theologians whose theology is based on the Logos doctrine, while their spirituality is based on the doctrine of the Spirit and these two reveal the liberals in conflict with themselves. In this also lies the reason for the acceptance of the doctrine of Filioque by the British Liberals. They use it because it appears to them a means of solving the problem of their uncertainty as to how to describe the Thou in the constellation of I and the Thou in God. This Thou with Logos-Pneuma, face in I and the Thou of God in Himself is really neither Logos nor Pneuma, for Logos and Pneuma do not reveal each other in Love but fight for themselves against each other. In this bynitarian dilemma lies the root of the trouble in Liberal Christology:- the Jesus of History and the Christ of Faith./

Faith. The relevance of Jesus the Christ is destroyed both for history and faith, and with it the Christian understanding of history and the meaning of Christian faith which is directed towards history. On the one side we have eschatology devouring history; and, on the other, an anthropomorphic representation of the kingdom of God. At this moment, on one side stands Rudolf Bultmann, and on the other the Biblical fundamentalists. The gulf between them is not so great as has been imagined. They both break the subject-object synthesis of the New Testament and its personalistic character. Bultmann takes the subjectivity and the fundamentalist the objectivity. In both cases the meaning of the Christian revelation (the creation of personality) is destroyed. Both these views have one thing in common - that man is an individual and not a personality. Both are assertions of the Jewish and not the Christian doctrine of God, with this difference - the fundamentalists still pay lip service to the Christian Trinitarian terminology from which they have emptied any relevance and meaning, while Bultmann denounces this as mythology. They both reveal a crisis in Christian theology which could be overcome only by an adequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit as Prolegomena to the doctrine of God as/

as the Trinity.

I have called this section of my studies a justification of the Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity. I have examined this problem together with the problem of the Personality of God. The relevance of this procedure to personalistic thinking is self-evident, for it is the one that is meaningful for dealing with an understanding of the revelation of God in Christ.

Christianity claims that God is Truth and Love, Creator and Redeemer. I have tried to explain the meaning of this claim by speaking of God as a personality. In so far as I have succeeded in explaining the personality of God in this thesis, thus far have I succeeded in the justification of the Christian doctrine of God. I hope I have also shown the *sine qua non* of the unity of this constellation.

Here we come to the point where we must disregard the neo-scholastic category of speaking about the Holy Trinity in terms of essential and economic Trinity. For personalistic thinking, this division confuses rather than enhances our understanding of the relevance and essential nature of the Christian doctrine of God for Christian theology and Christian faith.

APPENDIX I.

The statement of Tillich that God is beyond object-subject relationship is made in the following quotation: "If God is brought into the subject-object structure of being he ceases to be the ground of being and becomes one being among others (first of all a being who looks at him as an object). He ceases to be God who is really God." Tillich *ibid* 172.

While Tillich insists on the impossibility of subsuming God under the subject-object scheme, he says that this structure is grounded in the divine life. *ibid* p.278 "S" Theology: Vol.I.

Considering what Tillich says here in relation to what has already been said in this thesis on the Personality of God, it is right to say that the subject-object relationship is a category of finite being in which the finite being of man comprehends itself as personal. Man applies this category to God in what Barth would call *analogia fidei*. This term is more appropriate to personalistic thinking while *analogia entis* was created by impersonalistic conceptual thinking. God indeed transcends the subject-object relationship because His Personality is the perfect unity of these two. The perfect unity of subject-object relationship in God reveals the depth/

depth, - the Transcendence, of this relationship in Him. In our empirical thinking the subject-object relationship could never fully reveal transcendence from within themselves, because of the relative character of their unity; when God is conceived within this scheme, He naturally, in Tillich's words, "ceases to be the ground of being and becomes one being amongst others".

But if, on the other hand, we say that God is beyond the subject-object relationship, such a God cannot be conceived and such a God cannot reveal Himself in the world as its *raison d'être* and its Saviour. God is beyond the subject-object relationship, and beyond in this means the revelation of the depths of the being in God, in virtue of which God is a personal being *sui generis*, and such, the ultimate concern of all being and its ground of being. God must be thought to be such because, as has been pointed out earlier, in Him subjectivity and objectivity are in perfect unity.

Tillich's statement that God is beyond subject-object relationship should be corrected to read that God is the Absolute unity of subjectivity and objectivity. This in turn implies the Unity of subjectivity and objectivity, i.e. God's transcendence over them and His immanence in them. As regards man, the unity of subject-object inside/

inside him is relative, and he could only ground himself inside both and become personality by his participation in the love of God by the power of which the unity of subject and object are held.

In this discussion Tillich helps us to understand and appreciate the terminology of the Classical Christian Doctrine of God: Ousia and Hypostasis. Ousia is the revelation of the Depths of Divine Life, because of the Perfect Unity of the three Hypostases in God. God has Ousia, self-relatedness, only because in Him the three Hypostases are in perfect unity arising from their interdependence. In one sense it is possible to speak of Ousia as God beyond Hypostatical relationships, as the Transcendence of them, and yet, should we not understand the nature of this "Transcendence", and see the inseparable unity of Ousia and Hypostasis, or, to use Tillich's category, if we do not understand God as being both the unity of subject-object relationship and the transcendence of this relationship, then our understanding of the doctrine of God in the New Testament Revelation is hopeless.

The nature of the paradox is such that it remains constant torture to conceptual thinking, while in it lies all the dynamism of faith and the understanding of the Christian faith as the stupendous miracle of God's Love/

Love for personalistic thinking. Personalistic thinking rejoices in this paradox, for, through it, man comprehends the revelation of the Personality of God, and this Revelation helps him to understand the revelation of human personality, its nature, meaning and destiny. When man, through the revelation of God in Christ, grasps the mystery of the Personality of God, and through it the mystery of human personality, the step which follows next from this Logos part of the process is his own participation in the Divine-Human Personality, the one mirroring the other, and revealing their unity within their difference, and yet both created by Love which makes both necessary. Unity is necessary for love to have its ground; difference for love to have its freedom; without these two, love is fiction and not reality. The latter part, the Pneuma part of the process, is necessary to the Logos part of the process. The two are meaningless without each other.

APPENDIX II.

Karl Barth is right in his criticism of the Vestigium Trinitatis as conceived by Augustine. (v. The Doctrine of the Word of God, Eng. Trans. esp. 338). Barth's argument that the doctrine of the Trinity should be understood in the categories of Revealer, Revelation and Revealedness is very sound because of the theocentricity of these categories and their manward natures, through which man comprehends God. While all this is to be welcomed, it must be pointed out that Professor Barth's theology, with his concept of total effacement of the Image of God in man, impairs the relevance of the Christian Doctrine of God as the Trinity to human existence in general, in so far as it does not share consciously in the Revelation of God in Christ. In saying that the Image of God in man has been destroyed, one says in fact that no vestige of humanity was left in man, not even as a potentiality. This leads to the very absurd assertion that man may be a rational being where the Divine Image has disappeared. The inference from this is that 'natural' man may exist as a recognisable human being and contemplate the nature of the world and of human existence, as the Greek philosophers did, while God's image is destroyed/

destroyed inside man.

I have already said that the Image of God is the Immanence of God's love in human existence. I have also tried to make it clear, that God is Love because of his Triune nature. The very fact that 'natural man' has rationality, and is recognisable as a human being is due to the fact that the Love of God, though estranged by man's egocentricity and unresponsiveness to it, continues to succour man in its suffering. Should the Love of God cease to call man to itself, man would certainly lose the correlation between himself and the world, so completely that he would turn into something subhuman probably and nothing of him would be left to concern theologians, philosophers, or psychiatrists. The immanence of the consciousness in 'natural man' means that in him there is still a correlation between subject and object. (This appears to him as correlation between him and the world. It does not matter which is the object and which is the subject in this correlation. Both could be either.) The existence of this correlation means that the existence of the contact between God and man on some level of human existence, which may transcend human consciousness and should not for that reason be dismissed as non-existent. The correlation between man and the world means the/

the existence of the relationship of subject and object inside man. The 'natural man' is aware of this through philosophy when he experiences his transcendence in thought. The philosophical dictum to man: "Transcende te ipsum" is proof of this.

This is precisely the situation in human existence established by the Image of God in him. If the Image of God in man is destroyed, the subject-object unity in man will disappear and in consequence his rationality. The rejection of the Love of God on the part of 'natural man' does not mean its disappearance (and ipso facto of the Image of God). It means its suffering which introduces a strain in the subject-object relationship. They do not participate in freedom and love in each other. Their balance, which is in free acceptance of the Love of God, has been impaired. The subject-object in man fight for domination over each other. This inner conflict manifests itself as a struggle between the world and man, or man against himself. As the cleavage between the subject-object relationship in man grows, the consciousness is stretched to breaking point. Consciousness realises this threat and usually puts up a fight against this process of being uprooted from its depths, which lie in the unity of subject-object relationship. This cleavage between/

between subject-object relationship may enable consciousness to see intellectually things more sharply and manifest considerable intelligence. This kind of intelligence is brought by fight of subject-object against each other inside man. This leads to their separation. Consciousness may even clearly grasp the dreadfulness of its own situation because of the tension between the subject-object relationship, but it is powerless before the situation. Contemporary atheistic existentialism is an example of this. (Sartre, Heidegger). But this state in consciousness must be pitied rather than hailed, for it is a glorification of death. It expresses the highest degree of divine rejection in the world and reveals the suffering Love of God, which calls for co-suffering with those who are on the borders of total madness. This cleverness, accompanied by cynicism as found in the writings of Sartre, speaks of the ushering of the separation of Divine Love in creation from the object of its self-giving. This means a return into nothingness for the creature.

Barth was led into the teaching of total depravity because of his loyalty to the Calvinist tradition and his awareness of the complete newness of the creation in Christ. But one does not need to postulate a lost Image of God/

God to explain this newness. This newness comes from the reversed process of the subject-object relationship in man from their separation which destroys both, to their unity. This turning towards unity is sufficient to represent the revelation of God in Christ as a great miracle. Saint Athanasius' "Incarnation of the Word of God" is truer to the New Testament than Barth's theology. St. Paul, when he points out the reality of the New Life in Christ, always reminds his hearers of the emptiness of past life. Without this memory, Divine Grace revealed in Christ would not have meant much. Barth in fact says man could have no such memory. Barth's negative attitude to philosophy and natural theology springs from failing to understand the rationality of the 'natural man' as the continuation in him of the suffering love of God. This is the Divine Image impaired, but not effaced.

The mission of philosophy and natural theology should be understood positively in the sense that they prolong the possibility of this strained situation in man's consciousness. This is not a negative situation. Barth asks for the last judgment upon the earth by condemning philosophy and natural theology. He condemns the suffering love of God. Barth's theology is either/

either/or. In this sense there is an apocalyptic element in his theology.

During my studies under Barth and Karl Jaspers, the philosopher, who have no point of contact, I noticed that students who were fascinated by the lectures of both Barth and Jaspers were perplexed that they could equally well, and at the same time, appreciate the thought of two so philosophically and theologically different. The answer to this surely is that the suffering love of God makes a Christian very sensitive and appreciative of positive philosophical and humanistic thinking. Barth, who is one of the most sensitive theologians I have met, has, by his doctrine of total depravity, sacrificed the theological understanding of the suffering love of God, without which his own spirituality and sensitiveness would be unthinkable, to the theological tradition of Calvinism. The doctrine of Filioque is another sacrifice of Barth, the Christian theologian, to Barth, the son of the Christian tradition of the West. Of this more will be said later.

APPENDIX III.

THE DOCTRINE OF TRINITY AND THE IMAGE OF ANTI-GOD or THE IMAGE OF ANTI-CHRIST IN DOSTOYEVSKY

Human existence in the history of our present age is threatened inwardly by two conceptions of thought which are anti-personalistic. These are self-assertive individualism and totalitarian collectivism. They are deadly to the fulfilment of human existence in finding its meaning and rest, both of which Christians believe are to be found in the 'revelation of God in Christ'.

The Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity is the only meaningful doctrine which could show the way from the present situation which demonises human existence. The Christian doctrine of God declares that in the heart of God there lies a communion of love, through which God's Being affirms Itself and everything which exists. In this doctrine lies the message of Christianity that the fulfilment of human existence lies in the community, whereby every individual lives for the others and the others for him. In this lies the redemption of individualism and of collectivism which by nature are anti-God. They are both frightening because they reveal the Image of Anti-God by splitting the two sides of the Divine Nature, His Unity and His Diversity, and by opposing the one against the other, while in the two together lies the unbreakable structure of the Personality of God. The/

The conflict of totalitarian collectivism and bourgeois individualism reveal the image of the Non-being. (To dox ov).

Dostoyevsky, who reveals the Images of God and Anti-God in human existence, makes some interesting remarks on the nature of Anti-God. (1). In Dostoyevsky, the man who bears the Image of God is essentially man of sobornost, the ALLMAN, (svetchovyek). He embraces in Love no only his fellowmen but the whole creation. Father Zosima and Alyosha in "Brothers Karamazov" are such people. They are such because they are the creation of God in whom the Father and the Son in love renounce Themselves for each other, not seeking their own selfhoods but that of the other. Neither of them say "I am" but "Thou art". This fulness of Love in the Divine Life reveals within itself the Beauty and the Harmony in which the Love of the Father and of the Son displays the indestructability and the perfection of the power of being in God. This is the revelation of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit in Them in whom the Father's and the Son's "Thou art" to each other reveals the Divine "We are". (This "We are", while re-affirming the Father's and the/

1. vide V. Ivanov: "Freedom and the Tragico Life: The Harvel Press, 1952.

the Son's "Thou art" to each other, brings into mutual "Thou art's" the "I am because Thou Art" also, which would not be there if the Holy Spirit were not immanent in the Divine Life alongside the Father and the Son to reveal it.)

This conception of the Holy Spirit lies behind the words of Prince Mishkin in Dostoyevsky's "Idiot": "The Beauty will save the world". The world will be saved by the Divine Love in which the Harmony and the Beauty of the Being of God is revealed, whose Power will save the world from Ugliness which is Destruction. Beauty creates form and endues it with the Power of being, while ugliness destroys, revealing the Non-being.

The man in Dostoyevsky who bears the Image of the Anti-God and is the complete antithesis to the "Svetchovyak", lives in constant protest against God and human existence. He constantly repeats "No" to God and to life. Such people are Ivan Karamozov, who says that he returns the ticket for entrance into life to God, and Kirilov who commits suicide. There are hosts of others, especially in Dostoyevsky's novel "The Possessed" in which the Image of the Anti-God expresses itself in subtle but effective destruction of existence into Non-being.

The Anti-God whose children these heroes from the/

the underworld are, has no original being in himself, for he is a creature. He constantly fights against God, denies Him, and yet the act of Destruction reveals the anti-God displaying the three-foldness of his being. (imitating God who in the act of Creation reveals His own three-ness of persons). The "Demonic Trinity" cannot be called triune because the Anti-God is an uneasy Triumvirate, where the associates hate each other and work for the undoing of what the other is building, thus accomplishing the destruction of the first "Person" in the Anti-God, who (unlike the First person in the Holy Trinity) says "I am". Dostoyevsky calls him "Lucifer". All those that bear the Image of the Anti-God say the same "I am" to themselves, echoing Lucifer's message to them: "You shall be Gods". "Thou art who can say, like God, "I am". "Therefore thou art entitled to rule over the Universe, to have it in thy power and, like God, to contain it in thyself." (1).

When Lucifer had inspired man to claim Godhead for himself and as soon as "I am" man reflects upon his demonic "I am", Ahriman, the Second "Person" or rather modus of this Demonic "Trinity", comes and says to man, (unlike the/

1. vide Ivanov, ibid p. 127.

the Son of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity,) "You know you are not; give it up; commit suicide; you only pretend."

The third modus of the Anti-God is the female figure, the Beauty of Sodom, by which Dostoyevsky means the Ugliness of the Non-being - the Demoniac "We are not".

"When in "Crime and Punishment", Raskolnikov and Svidrigailov try to gaze into each other's nature and the former, full of loathing at the bottom of his soul - has to agree with his counterpart when the latter declares that the fatal bond between them is not fortuitous, that they have an essential affinity and resemble enemy twins - then it is Lucifer that dwells in one and Ahrinian who holds the other prisoner, and it is these two powers that survey each other within the other, the yawning black depths that are in both. For Dostoyevsky the two Demons are two manifestations of one substance; which is not, however, of necessity completely represented in this duality, but on the contrary contains in its Satanic depths a third and female figure, the Beauty of Sodom, which Dostoyevsky, that explorer of Hell, contrasts with the Beauty of our Lady." (1).

1. vide Ivanov, *ibid* p. 121.

Dostoyevsky contrasts the Ugliness of the Non-Being with the Beauty of our Lady, whose Son harrows Hell. This is interesting to the student of the Christian Doctrine of God in view of the excessive veneration of Our Lady in some Christian quarters. For this, "Mariolatry" - as Protestants like to call it, - was bound to occur where Christology and Pneumatology lost their unity and interdependence. The Incarnation affirms in the world that which causes it - i.e. brings it about. When the Christian theology failed to relate the Incarnation to the Holy Spirit it was inevitable that upon Our Lady should fall those Divine functions which belong to the Holy Spirit. Protestantism, which is quick to point out the exaggeration, is far from having an ideal solution to the problem of the disunity of Christology and Pneumatology. It may be pointed without any difficulty at certain characteristics in Protestantism which betray a fundamental similarity between the Cult of Mariology and itself. I doubt whether it is possible for both Roman Catholics and Protestants to avoid this as long as they are committed to the doctrine of God based upon Filioque.

APPENDIX IV.

Criticism of St. Augustine's 'psychological Trinity' is also valid for Dr. Dorothy Sayers' "Mind of the Maker", in which an argument based on 'analogia creationis' is propounded. In this book she speaks about a vestige of the Trinity in man as revealed in the structure of the creative mind of the artist. This is a rationalisation, i.e. a reading of the concept of Trinity into man. This particular analogy is especially dangerous, as the creativeness of the artist could and does often turn towards the destruction of personality. If the image of Trinity is immanent in man in the form described by St. Augustine and Dr. Sayers, this could never happen. Dr. Sayers defeats her own argument, especially when she justifies the doctrine of Filioque as the truth about Divine Life from the 'Trinity' in the mind of the artist. Thus, for instance, she says that the Creative Idea in mind (Image of God the Father) and the Creative Energy or Activity (Image of God the Son) beget the Creative Power (Image of God the Holy Spirit). If this is so, it is difficult to see how it is that the Idea, Energy and Power still preserve interdependence in the creativity of the artist. For the Idea and the Energy begotten from /

from it in the act of the proceeding of the Creative Power from them, cannot surely avoid being dominated by the Creative Power. So conceived, the creative mind of the artist reveals rather the image of the 'daemonion' than the Trinity of God.

The philosophers of human creativity, such as Berdyaev, point out that creativity of the mind reveals itself first as the power which begets activity and both are comprehended by the creative idea as their ground. This seems a better way of looking at the problem of the creativity of the artist's mind, as one sees how the daemonic element in human creativeness is controlled, while in Dr. Sayers' interpretation it is implicitly given freedom. This is not to say that the structure of the creative mind of the artist supports any vestige of the Trinity, 'filioquist' or not, but merely to point out that the 'filioquist' concept held by Dr. Sayers is inadequate to account for the element which controls the daemonic forces in human creativity.

Dorothy Sayers - "The Mind of the Maker" (Methuen & Co., London, 1941).

3. THE DOCTRINE OF FILIOQUE.

The mention of the doctrine of Filioque conveys to the different Christian believers different ideas. The most popular one of course is that of a partisan --- taking sides in some obscure controversy between Eastern Orthodox and Western Christianity which contributed to the separation in 1054 between Eastern and Western Christendom.

The second notion, found chiefly within Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity, is that the doctrine of filioque contains the solution to the problem of the relationship between the Second and Third Persons in the Holy Trinity, (namely the Christ and the Holy Spirit). The "solution" of the problem which the doctrine of the filioque conveys to Western Christians, is its strongest appeal. The neatness of the "solution" in its pithy form ("The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son ('Filioque')"), puts those who do not accept this doctrine in an unfavourable position, for whatever their answer (to the problem of the relationship between Son and Holy Spirit) may be, it certainly cannot have the brevity of the term "filioque".

Since the purpose of the present essay in this thesis is chiefly doctrinal, the historic-controversal approach to this doctrine will not be followed, except in the very limited sense/

/sense to illustrate a point of doctrinal importance we are presenting. (1) . It is proposed to study this doctrine under THE EXEGETICO-THEOLOGICAL ASPECT.

The New Testament Text which is central to the problem of the doctrine of the Filioque is St. John's Gospel, 15.26., where the Holy Spirit is taught to be proceeding from the Father/

(1) It suffices to say here in connection with the historic development of the doctrine of filioque the following: Wherever the "Christian princes and Emperors" have meddled in the sphere of Christian theology the result has not been too happy for the church. The victories won for the Church by the "Christian Emperors" in the sphere of dogmatic and theological disputes between Christians has weakened rather than strengthened the Church. The inroads of Mohammedanism into Eastern Christianity is a case in point (in the VIIth and VIIIth centuries). The weakness of Roman Catholicism in the time of the inquisition and in the time of the Reformation until the rise of the secular States is due to the same causes. The inner weakness of Anglicanism and Lutheranism is engendered in the fact of meddling of "Christian Kings and Princes" with Christian theology. The point I am trying to make here is the meddling of Charlesmagne, the Holy Roman Emperor, with theology and the patronage he gave to the Filioque doctrine (vide V. Ródzianko, "The Filioque Dispute and its importance", in the E.C.Q., Vol.X, Winter, 1953, P.191. Karl Barth, "The Doctrine of the Word of God", pps.546, ff A. Fortèsque, "The History of the Eastern Orthodox Church" P.382.)).

It is true that from the time of Augustine at least, this doctrine was familiar to the West; it was promulgated by the Spanish Church at the Council of Toledo (589), but there are good historical reasons for believing that this doctrine would have remained a local issue and a theologumena rather than a dogma if it were not for the great Emperor whose Imperial prestige stamped it upon the Western Empire. With the West it has been ever since a 'fait accompli', to be defended rather than examined. In both East and West this doctrine has created a great prejudice, ever obvious in the approach of Eastern and Western Christians to each other.

/Father (ἐκπορεύεται) and whom Christ will send from the Father (πέμψω). The Western Church has interpreted the meaning of these two terms "procession" and "sending" as being the same. (1) And ultimately it has committed itself to the teaching which defines the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son in the identical terms, that of the procession from both ("Spiritus Sanctus ex patre filioque procedit"). This view is argued to have the support of the New Testament. The following quotation from the Lutheran theologian F. Pieper will suffice to illustrate this:

"The Christians of the first centuries..... believed the fact of the filioque on the basis of Scriptures which called the Holy Spirit not only the Spirit of the Father (Matt.10.20.); but also the Spirit of the Son (Gal.4.6.). Scripture furthermore, ascribes the sending of the Spirit to the Son (Jn15.26; 16.7.), as well as to the Father (Jn.14.16.), in fact it adds the significant expression 'that the Holy Spirit would not speak of Himself, but shall receive His message from the Son' (Jn.16.13-14.), and is therefore called 'the breath of His (the/

(1) De Regnon: "Etudes de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinite", series 3,11, P.257-8:- "Jé me borne ici a faire remarquer, combien il est utile de tenir ferme ce principe que toute veritable 'Mission' implique une 'Procession'".

110.
/((the Messiah's) lips". (Is. 11.4.), and the Spirit of His
mouth ("The Word") (11 Thes. 2.8.). The procession
of the Spirit from the Son is also clearly indicated
in Jn. 20.22., when Christ breathed on His disciples
and said: "Receive the Holy Ghost". (1)

Since the Gospel of St. John is of central importance
for those who adhere to the doctrine of Filioque,
and to those who reject it, it is relevant at this point
to/

-
- (1) Frances Pieper, "Christian Dogmatics" Vol. 11. P. 415.
vide also Karl Barth, "The Doctrine of the Word",
P. 549:- "Whence do we get the right to isolate
passages like John 15.26., which speak from the
procession of the Spirit from the Father, in face
of others which just as clearly describe Him as the
Spirit of the Son".
A typical answer (to these charges) of the Eastern
Orthodox theologians may be illustrated from a
Dogmatic written by a Russian Orthodox theologian,
Ternovsky, in the last century. The Filioque
doctrine is not true, he says, on the following
grounds:-
(a) It contradicts the words of the Saviour who has
clearly said: 'The Holy Spirit proceeds from the
Father'. Here Christ makes a distinction between
the eternal procession and the temporal sending
implied in the words: "Whom I will send to you from
the Father".
(2) The Filioque doctrine is based upon a distorted
interpretation of certain texts of the Holy Scriptures,
e.g. Jn. 16.13. ('He, the Holy Spirit, will glorify
me for He will receive from me'). Here the procession
from the Son is not meant; but the Teacher -- the Spirit
of Truth, whom the Saviour has promised to the Apostles
after the ascension, will not declare to them any new
teaching, different from that which Jesus the Christ
preached, but will establish them in this same teaching.
The Holy Spirit (in Rom. 8.9. : Gal. 4.6.) is called
the Spirit of the Son of God not because the Holy
Spirit proceeds from the Son, but because Jesus the
Christ has procured His gifts for men.
P. Ternovsky, "Dogmatics" P. 74, ff.
For the Roman Catholic argument on this doctrine
vide notes at the end of this essay.

/to state my main objection to the claim that the Fourth Gospel upholds the doctrine of Filioque. The doctrine of God (which engenders the problem of the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit, to which the doctrine of Filioque is in view of those who hold it the solution), is stated paradoxically, namely, in terms of complete identity between Father and Son (which is implicit all through this Gospel), and also the difference between them. (The Father is greater than I Jn.14.28.). The difference between the Father and the Son of which the Fourth Gospel speaks comes from the mutual recognition of the Father and the Son, which implies that their identity does not mean their merging in an impersonal sense into each other's being, but rather the existence of the relationship between them which implies the difference between them. (The quoted verse from Jn.14.28., ought to be understood as expressing this thought and not any subordination of the Son to the Father).

The doctrine which teaches that the Holy Spirit 'ex patre filioque procedit' violates this paradox and destroys it. The doctrine of Filioque is based solely on the identity between the Father and the Son. This makes the appeal to the texts from the Fourth Gospel in support of the doctrine of Filioque meaningless, after the paradox (consisting/

/(constituting of the identity and the difference between the Father and the Son) is taken away. (1).

- (1) I have dealt with the problem of the interpretation of Jn.20.22., earlier. Here, however, I would like to add the views expressed by Theodoro of Mopsuetia, where he opposes the interpretation that the Holy Spirit was given by Christ's breathing upon His Apostles. He interprets the meanings of Christ's words "Receive the Holy Ghost" as meaning only "You shall receive Him after my Ascension". (This fragment is extant in the Latin Version: Migne, LXVI, 783. Vide H.B. Swete: "The History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit", P.139; and also Adam Zorhikav: "Orthodox Theological Interpretation concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit", Vol.11. P.79.

"We ought to mention, that to infer the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son on the ground that He was given to the Apostles by the Saviour's breathing upon them (Jn. XX.22), would mean also that we ought to infer such procession of the Holy Spirit from the Apostles who communicated the Holy Spirit to the believers by the laying of their hands upon them, (Acts viii. 17.); or to conclude that our soul proceeds eternally from God, who breathed into the face of Adam the breath of life. (Gen.ii. 7.).

According to the interpretations of the fathers, the Saviour in no way suggested the thought of the procession of the Holy Spirit from Him through His breathing upon the Apostles. He only made the Apostles capable of receiving the Holy Spirit. He gave them the power or grace to bind and loose and communicated to them even the very power of the Holy Spirit, less only than that which they received on the Day of Pentecost".

(Inokentii: "Božeslovie Oblichitelynoe". Kazan, 1859. Vol.11. pp.26,27.).

I think however that the Fourth Evangelist states implicitly that the Holy Spirit is related both to the Father and to the Son, but not in the same sense of the procession from both but only that of proceeding from the Father and 'abiding' upon the Son. The term 'abiding' is New Testament usage and explains adequately the nature of the New Testament Revelation, namely that in Christ the Holy Spirit meets the believer, and that in the Holy Spirit Christ makes Himself known to the believer. The Formula "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and abides upon the Son" corresponds admirably to the doctrine of God as represented by the Fourth Evangelist. It safeguards both the identity which exists between Father and Son, and also safeguards the difference of their hypostatic selfhood.

The possible objection that the term 'abiding' shows only a passive relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit is not valid, for the 'abiding' of the Holy Spirit upon the Son means that the Son receives completely in Himself the Godhead of the Father and also reveals it. (1) In His self-giving to the Father the Son returns it to/

-
- (1) At the Bonn Conference (1875) between Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and Old Catholics, an agreement on the basis of the theology of St. John of Damascus was reached. "The Holy Spirit is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father, issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son, as the Power radiating from Him".
 Vide Church Problems; a view of modern Anglicanism", ed. H.H. Benson, P.228.

/to the Father, both of them thus participating in the Godhead which is nothing else but the mutuality of their relationship revealed in the Holy Spirit. "Ex patre filioque procedit" answers the problem of the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit for the mind only, and as such belongs to the category of conceptual thinking, but fails to satisfy the spiritual life of the believer; because it does not reveal the dynamism of the Divine Life, as shown forth in the New Testament revelation: Namely, that the relatedness of God Himself (implied in the Relationship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit), acts upon the believer in Christ in such a way that the believer participates in this relatedness of God to Himself, through Christ and the Holy Spirit. The Doctrine of the filioque does not satisfy the personalistic thinking and that is its chief failure. (The term 'personalistic thinking' is a Christian theological category which describes the experience of a Christian believer, whereby through the revelation of God in Christ, the believer conquers the sense of non-being in human existence and the dread of the finitude in it, and knows Himself participating in the Love of God through which the believer's existence transcends here and now its relativity and temporality).

The formula: "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and abides upon the Son", explains satisfactorily why/

/why the "sending" of the Holy Spirit belongs both to the Father and the Son; for in the Holy Spirit the Godhead of the Father and the Son is revealed (which means their participation in each other. There would be no participation if there is only identity between Father and the Son which the doctrine of the "Filioque" implies). The Father and the Son reveal the Holy Spirit not by the procession of the Holy Spirit from both; but by the Father's giving Himself completely to the Son, i.e., by bestowing upon Him the Holy Spirit and the Son's renunciation of Himself to the Father. This dual act does not imply the double procession of the Holy Spirit (from the Father and the Son), but the Son's own begetting from the Father. This means the Holy Spirit's equality with the Father and the Son and the common participation of all three Persons of the Godhead in each other. In the doctrine of "Filioque" there is something "aposteriori" about the Holy Spirit. The sending of the Holy Spirit has like the procession an eternal character, but this does not imply the identity between the two acts; rather their interdependence. (1) If this view is not maintained/

- (1) The eternal character of sending as described above implies in itself the sending of the Holy Spirit in temporal sense. For it implies the Act of Revelation of God to man which is imminent in the Nature of Triune God Who is Love. From the point of human history this occurs as Kairos. The Kairos signifies precisely the revelation (which is also its communication) of the eternal nature of God, conditioned to the spiritual growth of man in particular time, that is why there are many Kairoi, and why the sending of the Holy Spirit in temporal sense may be manifold, in spite of the eternal character of the sending, which is *raison d'être* a temporal sendings of the Holy Spirit.

/maintained the result would be the assertion of the identity between the Father and the Son which has negated the difference between them.

It is wrong, as it is sometimes done, to speak of the procession as eternal, while the "Sending" (mission) of the Holy Spirit is described as having only temporal character. Nevertheless this must be accepted as the right interpretation of the term "Sending" in the Fourth Gospel. (1) This is necessitated by the exegetical meaning of the passages in the Fourth Gospel and the interdependence of Christology and Pneumatology implied in the New Testament Revelation. The Son of God who is eternally begotten by the Father is incarnate in one particular/

- (1) Denique multum hoc facit, quod verbum procedendi in tempore presenti sit et verbum missionis in textu continuo futuri tempori est. Que locutio, si hic procedere idem sit, quod mitti, coacta & insolens esset; presentim cum & de Patre Spiritum Sanctum mittente dicens Christus, pariter in futuro verbum mittendi expresserit, Ioan XIV:16. Ego rogabo Patrem, Et alium paraclenum dabit vobis. Et ibidem V.26. Paraclenus autem ille, Spiritus Sanctus Quem mittet Pater in nomine meo: Sed & verbum presentis temporis valde idoneum est ad rem aeternam perpetuam & immutabilem exprimendum, quem ad modum Notavimus lib. Superiore de illo textu: antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum. Vides, ut & scopus dicti & structura orationis & verbi dedinatio singularis & rerum diversitas mire secum conspiciant; alioquin omnia frustra essent. P.30. (Theophanis Procopowicz, "Tractatus de Processione Spiritus Sancti", Gothae A.D. MD. CCLXXII).

/particular time in history; so the Holy Spirit who eternally proceeds from the Father and abides upon the Son is given to the Church to abide in it in a particular moment of History i.e., at Pentecost (for Christ abides in His Church after He has revealed Himself fully as the Incarnate Son of God). (I have argued earlier that the Fourth Evangelist has in view "The Pentecost" when he speaks of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the disciples whom the Father and the Son will send.). The doctrine of Filioque makes the whole relationship of the Father and the Son static and mechanical and consequently depersonalizes this relationship. The doctrine of God based upon this impersonal scheme does not give justice to the dynamic and majestic nature of God of whom the New Testament speaks viz., His self giving to man in His revelation in Christ. The God of the New Testament Revelation could be best described in words used by Rudolf Otto as *Mysterium tremendum et fascinans*. God of the Christian Revelation is such precisely because of the mutual renunciation of the Father and the Son on each other's behalf (which is also God's renunciation on Man's behalf). The formula, "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son" sounds a pronouncement about God, which does not concern man, but only God. There is nothing about God revealed in Christ which is not of primary importance for man.

The/

/The formula: "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and abides upon the Son", shows that the relationship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit concerns man ultimately.

The doctrine that the Holy Spirit 'ex Patre Filioque procedit' obscures the Absoluteness of Revelation and God's complete emptying of Himself, for it takes away the dialectic and dynamism of God in Revelation which consists in the paradox of the identity of the Father and the Son and in their difference of hypostatic selfhood without which there could be no Incarnation and no revelation. The doctrine of God based on the Filioque achieves the identity of the "substance" of God but not the identity of the Divine personality. For this reason the filioquist doctrine of God is a philosophical-conceptualist interpretation of God, and as such does not express the spirit of the New Testament revelation, where God is described not as an identity of substance, but as participation of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in each other. It is because of this participation that when God reveals Himself to man, (which is the act of His self-giving to man), that the man who receives God also participates in His Love and is redeemed from sin and non-being. If God is an identity of substance which the Filioque 'mutatis mutandis' affirms, there is no participation; there is some kind of semi-personal being called/

/called 'God' which pervades all things in a pantheistic sense. The Roman Catholic theology is thus committed to the postulation of the Beatific Vision of God as the destiny of man, as revealed in Christ. This certainly is not the Kingdom of God of the New Testament Scriptures, but the Neo-platonic merging into THE ONE, which is also THE ALL, --- the identity of substance.

Rather, the Kingdom of God is mutual Love and succour, mutual recognition of the uniqueness of each other. It is self-sacrificial Love which finds itself and its fulness through self-sacrifice. Love means that man in freedom participates in God and God in Him. Here man is not a spectator, he seeks the Kingdom of God as a community of persons grounded on Divine Love, and God revealing Himself to them. The Beatific Vision is a pantheistic, aesthetic category which pre-supposes man as a 'psyche', man as an 'ego', as an individual, as man for whom God is a means of his own self-gratification for this man is a means of self-gratification for God in an egoistic sense. (1). This whole/

(1) Cf. Westminster Shorter Catechism:-

Q. - "What is the chief end of man?"

A. - Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever."

/whole conception is degrading to God and man, and the whole relationship between Divine and human personality as revealed in Christ stands outside this hypnotic mysticism. (1). This whole view pre-supposes God who shrinks into Himself to protect Himself within Himself from the tragedy of existence and who 'absorbs' them into Himself, who are afraid of the non-being in existence; God shields them with His grace; this is the Beatific Vision. (2).

The New Testament revelation speaks of a God who takes risks to the utmost and surrenders Himself to the non-being outside Himself. According to the New Testament God goes out of Himself, he disrupts His own "substance" and plunges into the "substance" of non-being, and out of it calls the personality of man into being, which takes/

(1) "Dans la tradition de L'Eglise D'Orient, il n'y a pas de place pour une theologie et, encore moins, pour une mystique de l'essence divine. Pour cette spiritualite la fin derniere, la beatitude du Royaume celeste n'est pas la vision de l'essence, mais avant tout la participation a la vie divine de la Sainte Trinite, l'etat deifie des "coheritiers de la nature divine", dieux crees apres le Dieu incree possedant par la grace tout ce que la Sainte Trinite possede par nature".
Vladimir Lossky: "Essai Sur La Theologie Mystique De L'Eglise D'Orient", Page 65.f.

(2) Dom Mark Pontifex: "Belief in Trinity" P.75. ff.

(1)

/takes the non-being into itself and conquers it. The personality of man does this through the participation in God Who is the PERSONALITY 'par excellence', that is, who is selfsubsistent, self-related, and existing 'sui generis'. Human personality acknowledges this Act of God on its behalf by renouncing itself to God in Love. It does not seek the Beatific Vision; bliss and suffering are irrelevant to it insofar and as so long as God participates in human existence and man is prompted to love God, extending that Love to the whole of God's creation thus contributing to the establishment of the order of existence in which God's Love has reconciled man to itself, and man to Himself, to his fellow-man, and to the whole of God's creation. This is what the New Testament calls the Kingdom of God. In this conception, the personality finds its destiny, while the conception of the Beatific Vision falsifies the meaning of the Kingdom of God, of personality, and its destiny.

- (1) What do we mean by saying that "God disrupts His own substance"? This is true only if "Substance" in this connection is conceived as meaning something which precedes God's relatedness to Himself, which is disclosed in the participation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in each other. This participation creates God's unity and His diversity or what Classical Theology calls God's "substance" ("ousia") and God's hypostases. God's "Substance" and Hypostases mutually create each other, neither dominating the other. If the threeness of Hypostases is dominated by substance, The Divine freedom would be destroyed by the Divine ground. If the Divine substance is dominated by the threeness of Hypostases, the Divine Freedom would destroy the Divine ground, and in consequence itself, because it would cease to be related to itself; not would there be participation of God in Himself.

The idea of Divine substance is a concept which is alien to the New Testament revelation. The concept of the identity of the Divine "substance" upon which the doctrine of the Filioque is based, is not a Christian theology. (1). (Needless to say, the concept of the Beatific Vision as defined by Roman Catholic Theology which is based upon the idea of God as the identity of substance is not acceptable).

In the third part of this thesis, we hope to show the practical aspect of the Doctrine of God based on the Filioque. (There will be pointed out how the forms through which God reveals Himself claim ultimacy for themselves, and become authoritarian and impersonalistic. This is because God is conceived substantially, which means the merging of the CONTENT of revelation and the media of revelation. This depersonalizes both. In this, the media identify themselves with the content, instead of being in personalistic mutuality with the content of revelation, and claiming nothing for itself, but letting itself be transparent to the content of revelation, /

-
- (1) "Das Katholische "Filioque" kann nur einen doppelten Sinn haben. Entweder ist "dasjenige, worin Vater und Sohn eins sind die göttliche Wesenheit; oder aber es gibt noch irgen - keine nicht-substanzielle und nicht-hypostatistische sondern überhypostatistische Einheit, welche den Vater mit dem Sohn verbindet, aber den Geist ausschließt". Karsawin Ostliches Christentum. Vol. 11. P. 355.

/revelation, which does not absorb the media into itself, but establishes its hypostatic objectivity).

PART II.

In the past, discussion of the doctrine of Filioque has been based chiefly upon the patristic literature. (1). There are three main lines of argument. (i) That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. (2). (ii) That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. (3). (iii) That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. (4). I believe that the Doctrine of God which is formulated in terms of filioque, is not in accordance with New Testament revelation. The alternative formula, "through the Son", does not express the mutuality of the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the sense in which we find it in the New Testament. This formula is too weak to be adequate. There is something too impersonal and detached about it/

-
- (1) Vide H.B. Swete: "The History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit"; Watkins Johns: "The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church"; Adam Zernikav: op.cit; Theophanis Procopowicz: "Tractatus de Processione Spiritus Sancti", Gothae, A.D. MDCCLXXII. Erasmus - 2nd Edition N. Testament of March 1519. ("briefed" by Leo X. date of Pope's "Brief" being Sept. 1518.) contains Nicene Creed in Greek with "filioque" clause omitted.
 - (2) Paul Henry, S.J., "On some implications of the 'ex Patre Filioque Tanquam Ab Uno Principio'", E.C.Q., Vol. VIII. 1948.
 - (3) E.C.Q., Vol. X. No. 4. Winter 1953; V. Rodzianko, "The Filioque Dispute and its importance".
 - (4) E.C.Q., Vol. VII. Supplementary issue, 1948. V. Lossky, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the Orthodox Triadology".

/it to be acceptable. The teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, is a logical and inevitable conclusion for those who accept the Doctrine of God as formulated by the Cappadocian Fathers, which I do not consider satisfactory. (1). My conviction is that the New Testament revelation implies an organic mutuality of Christology and Pneumatology, and I consider that the formula, "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and abides upon the Son" adequately expresses this mutuality, and in it lies the answer to the Filioquist and anti-Filioquist alike. Moreover, this view is implied in New Testament revelation.

In the remaining part of this Chapter, a short reference to the doctrine of Filioque in Prof. Karl Barth's Theology seems relevant, because Barth's adherence to the doctrine of filioque reveals clearly the whole Protestant attitude to this doctrine. (2).

Two reasons seem to have lead Barth to his adherence to this doctrine: First, the doctrine of Filioque belongs to the Western Christian Tradition, which conditions the whole/

(1) Vide Appendix 1 at the end of this chapter.

(2) K. Barth; "The Doctrine of the Word of God", Engl. Transl. P.513.ff.

/whole of Protestant Theology. The doctrines of Protestant Theology are defined chiefly in relationship to Roman Catholic Theology. That means that Protestant sides with Roman Catholic Theology in those doctrines which the West accepts over against the East, and which were not issues during the Reformation period. Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Christianity did not face each other directly in the past except very slightly (due to a great extent to historical circumstances) and in consequence they have defined the attitude towards each other negatively. For Protestantism, Eastern Orthodoxy is another kind of "unredeemed Catholicism". For Eastern Orthodoxy, Protestantism is ultimately "another kind of Roman Catholicism", in which the 'unsoborniy' character of Western Christianity first manifested in the rise of the Papacy is a logical consequence. Eastern Orthodox and Protestant relationships are vitiated by a great prejudice. This prejudice cannot be removed so long as both sides uncritically accuse each other as being "another kind of Roman Catholicism". I doubt whether this is possible until Protestants are theologically clear about the issues which divide Roman Catholics from Eastern Orthodoxy; and how far these issues divide or bring together Protestants and Eastern Orthodox. In its turn, Eastern Orthodoxy must examine the issues raised at the Reformation and see how far these were an attempt to return to the Orthodox "Soborniy"

/"Soborniy" principle of the Church. It must also examine the "Protestant principle" in relation to the existential nature of the Christian revelation. The Protestants on their part, must do the same in relation to the "Orthodox principle". The Eastern Orthodox define this criterion as "sobornost", and there is no reason to interpret it otherwise, as it includes both freedom and complete togetherness. This corresponds to the spirit in which the Church conceives the Trinity --- complete unity in diversity. Such a basis could create theologically a possibility of Orthodox and Protestant "rapprochement" in a very real and spiritual sense.

When Protestant Theology, as is the case with Barth, defends the Roman Catholic doctrine of "Filioque", (1). he destroys what he is anxious to establish: an independence from Roman Catholicism of the Christian principle implied in Protestantism. Barth is here misled by thinking that the doctrine of Filioque is necessitated, if one is to establish the absoluteness of the Revelation of God in Christ/

(1) I call it "Roman Catholic" advisedly, because the whole Roman Catholic ecclesiology is based upon it, including Papal Infallibility. Barth remarks that this view should not be taken seriously. *ibid.* P. 547. ff.

/Christ. He thinks that his doctrine of the Word of God would lose its true nature if the doctrine of Filioque is not implicit in it. His grudge against Eastern Orthodoxy is that by refusing the doctrine of Filioque it diminishes the significance of the absoluteness of the Revelation of God in Christ. Therefore his 'Caveat' in relation to Eastern Orthodox Theology.

But the reasons for which Barth holds the Doctrine are different from those for which Roman Catholicism holds it. In Barth the doctrine of Filioque is of a theological nature, while in Roman Catholicism it is of ecclesiological nature. Protestant and Roman Filioquism stand on two different planes. If Barth and other Protestants would recognise this, the issue would be simplified. The Eastern Orthodox reject the doctrine of Filioque for the same reasons for which Barth accepts it; namely the Absoluteness of the Revelation of God in Christ. This rejection safeguards it from being interpreted to mean 'ipso facto' the absoluteness of the media which express this revelation --- they are the historic ecclesiastical institution (as in Roman Catholicism), or the absoluteness of a historic book as in Biblical Fundamentalism (as in Protestantism). When this happens, it clearly implies that the Christian doctrine of God as the Trinity is conceived modalistically and not personalistically/

/personalistically. The Eastern Orthodox see in the Doctrine of Filioque (where the Father and the Son merge into each other to become 'unum principium' of the Procession of the Holy Spirit), the implicit form of this modalism to which Barth comes very near. This may be seen from the following quotation:- "If the Son is not the proper origin of the Spirit, Father and the Son have not everything in common, but their origination in respect of the Spirit falls apart into a primary and a merely secondary." (1) The logical consequence of the doctrine of filioque is that the Holy Spirit is only an 'aspect' (modus) of God, which does not stand in relationship to the Father and to the Son as the Creator of their relationships, never to be thought of as brought forth out of this relationships as Filioque suggests, but immanent in it. If the Holy Spirit is brought forth in this way, He assumes into Himself the Father and the Son, and becomes an aspect of both; and they of Him. Thus the Holy Spirit destroys what He creates - the relationship of the Father and the Son. The Divine unity achieved in this way is the unity of God conceived as "Deitas" and not of God as personality. It is not by accident that Barth rejects/

(1) Barth, *ibid.*, p.552.

/rejects the doctrine of God based upon the principle of "perihorosis", which implies participation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in each other (Barth, *ibid.*, P.555.). For the modalistic principle presupposes not the mutuality of the Divine Persons, but a fixed order:- Father, Son and Holy Spirit, whereby the origin of each Divine Person is determined by the first modus producing the second modus, and the first and second the third modus. Here God is a Trinity who does not 'create' and reveal Himself, from Himself, but God is subject to the "order" in which the forms of His being follow each other, so that they cannot break the "bond" which keeps them in unity. This view is incompatible with God conceived as personality.

The conception of God as Trinity in Barth appears more as a theological construction imposed upon God to allow for a dialectical theology to express itself in a system; rather than the interpretation of the very nature of God as Love. And yet one finds in Barthian theology a personalistic note and dynamism which presupposes a view of the Trinity as common participation of all three Divine Persons' in each other. This element implies also the doctrine of God as Trinity as the basis of Christian Theology and of Christian Spirituality. Without an understanding of Barth in this way, one cannot comprehend "later" Barth where his theology must be interpreted to mean/

/mean that the destiny of the Christian believer is to become a personality by his participation in the Divine Personality. Barthian Theology is built on a structure of thought which is rigidly scholastic and conceptual, while the spirituality which prompts his theology is inspired by personalistic motives. In his doctrine of God as the Trinity, which is based on the Filioque doctrine, Barth considers the problems involved from the standpoint of thought only. And not from the existential situation of the revelation of God in Christ; where God and man meet each other in the act of surrender one to the other in love and yet in surrendering find completely themselves without losing their selfhood. I donnot think that Barth's doctrine of God with its strong modalistic tendency is adequate to carry the weight of the suffering and triumphant love of the personality of God revealed in Christ. It is difficult to see how it is possible for Barth to escape modalistic leanings in his doctrine of God when his doctrine is based upon Filioque.

The failure of the Eastern Orthodox Theology in regard to the problems raised by the doctrine of Filioque has been: First, it did not define more explicitly in the terms of the Christian doctrine of God, as the Trinity, the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit; for the formulae "the Holy/

/Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone" or "From the Father through the Son", are not adequate: Secondly, Eastern Orthodox Theology has failed to point out the implications of the doctrine of God based on Filioque both in its theological-doctrinal and practical aspects. They have contended themselves mainly by valid but not all important argument, that the Filioque was not the decision of an Ecumenical Council, but was imposed arbitrarily by the Western Church. (1)

(1) Dogmatic Theology: Peter Ternovskoy (Russian)
Moscow 1839. P.75.

Note A:

The Roman Catholic argument for Filioque is based on the logic of scholasticism. This argument proceeds from the scholastic dictum, "In God all things are one, except where there intercedes the opposition of a relation" ("Omnia Sunt unum, ubi non obiat relationis oppositio").

The Holy Spirit is God identified with every perfection of the simple essence of God. He is distinguished from God the Father only by mutual relation of "Spiratio" or "procession".

This distinguishes him from the Father and He proceeds also from the Son. If He did not, there would be no relation between them but identification. The only way in which there can be three really distinct Persons in the Blessed Trinity is that there is a real relation between each of them - Paternity between the first and second, Procession between the first and the third, and Procession also between the second and third. (V. Andrian Fortescue Op.Cit. Page 377). Fortescue, speaking somewhat arbitrarily about the unshakable logic of this argument says: "So from the point of view of Scholastic Theology, the thesis of the Latin Schoolmen is unanswerable". (Ibid.) But one may ask whether the procession of the Holy Spirit from both Father and the Son negates the distinction between Father and the Son? If the answer is no because their relationship is determined by the distinction between them established by Father's begetting/

/begetting of the Son, does not the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son negate the distinction which begetting establishes? One cannot have it both ways, for the begetting from the Father and ^{the} procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son cancel each other.

Vladimir Lossky, the Russian theologian says that Scholastic logic on Filioque presupposes: (1) That the relations are the basis of the persons which are to be defined by their mutual opposition, the Father to the Son and these two to the third; (2) That the First Person and Second together are a non-personal unity in that they give rise to a further relation of opposition; (3) That therefore the origin of the Persons of the Trinity, in general, is impersonal, having its real basis in the one essence, differentiated by eternal relations. The general character of this triadology may be thus described: it gives pre-eminence to the Unity of the nature, rather than to the Trinity of the Persons; in it there is an ontological primacy of the essence over the hypostases "Inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is One Person, the Father and the Son, to Whom He is thus related, appear in their natural absence of distinction; inasmuch as the Father and the Son are two distinct Persons, the Holy Spirit only represents their unity/

/unity in their identical nature. "E.C.Q. Vol. VII, 1948, P.36.f.

Note B:

In his History of the Orthodox Eastern Church (London 1916) Andrian Fortescue in the chapter on "Filioque", page 372 f, speaks about Filioque as the great Shibboleth for Eastern Orthodox Christianity. This is partially true and the reason for this in the past can be best appreciated from the Old Russian polemical works against the Latins from Eleventh Century to the Fifteenth Century. (Collected and edited by Audrey Popov, Moscow 1875, Page 157). Here it is clearly illustrated that for the Orthodox the Filioque meant a denial of the ipsissima verba of our Lord in St. John 15.26, where the Holy Spirit is spoken of: "He proceeds from the Father". The addition to this verse of Filioque was interpreted as blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (Mark 3.28); for the Latin doctrine of Filioque dared to temper arbitrarily with the words of Scripture. This tempering with Scripture was interpreted by the Eastern Orthodox to mean that the Latins were directly under the curse of the Scripture, according to Galatians 1.8, which these documents cite. This reverence for the authority of Scripture and adherence to its texts and opposition to any Ecclesiastical authority which/

/which asserted teachings which could not be supported by Scripture may sound fundamentalistic to modern minds with the axe of Biblical criticism to grind. But this should reveal to those who are not acquainted with Eastern Orthodox Christianity its adherence through history to the pre-eminence of the Scripture in the Church.

(APPENDIX)

The doctrine of God in the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers is responsible for defining the procession of the Holy Spirit as being from the Father alone. The logic of this point of view is admirably expressed by V. Lossky, a Russian theologian in an essay entitled, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the Orthodox Tradition". (E.C.Q. Vol. V11, 1948). Lossky's view is based on the doctrine of the monarchy of the Father which describes God the Father as being the cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit who are caused by Him. "This unique cause is not prior to His effects for in the Trinity there is no priority or posteriority. He is not superior to His effects, for the product cannot produce inferior effects". (Page 41). The Father could not be fully and absolutely Personal unless the Son and the Holy Spirit were equal to Him in the common possession of the same nature and were that same nature /

/nature (Ibid., P.42) Lossky adds: This idea might make people think that each of the persons of the Trinity could be regarded as the cause of the other two, in that He is not the common essence; That would be equivalent to making the Persons a matter of relationships in a new way, by changing them into conventional and interchangeable signs of three diversities. Roman Catholic Theology avoids this kind of personal relativism by professing belief in the procession of the Holy Spirit, ab utroque, i.e., by falling into an impersonal relativism. That of relations of opposition, regarded as the basis of the existence of the Three Persons in the Unity of the essence. Orthodox Theology takes as its starting point, the initial autonomy of essence and hypostasis, and avoids personal relativism by attributing causality to the Father alone. The monarchy of the Father sets up irreversible relationships, which enable us to distinguish the two other from the Father, and yet to relate them to the Father as a concrete principle of Unity in Trinity". (Ibid)

The view which Lossky criticizes bears an apparent similarity to the conception of the Doctrine of God as the Trinity as presented in this thesis and for this reason my view should be re-emphasized here. I have said that each Person in the Trinity is not a cause of the other two but in each one the other two are revealed to Him, and to each/

/each other and He to and in Them. The possibility of revelation in this sense reveals that God is Personality par excellence, or Personality sui generis; whereby the revelation of the Divine Persons in each other in this way shows their participation in each other and their interdependence. There is no cause or effect here, there is only God from Himself unto Himself and for Himself. In this participation of Divine Persons in each other and the revelation of themselves in each other, God reveals Himself as Love in an absolutely perfect sense. He reveals also man from Himself (because the perfection and absoluteness of the Love of God is such that it calls man out of non-being) and gives Himself to man and is God for man in the sense that He succours man continually. This view does not need Filioque, nor the Monarchy of the Father conceived as the Cause.

Lossky goes on to say, and here I am in agreement with him, that Personal God cannot be a Monad and He also cannot be a Dyad. He must be more than One unique person - the Dyad is always an opposition of terms in that it cannot signify absolute diversity. The procession of the Holy Spirit is an infinite "passage" beyond the dyad or pair of opposites: it is this "passage beyond", "dépassement" which/

/which consecrates the Absolute (as opposed to the relative) diversity among the Persons. This "passage" beyond the dyad does not mean that the Persons are an infinite series, but that the procession of the Third Person has an infinite character. Triad suffices to denote the Living God of Revelation. Lossky says that the place for Dyad in God is artificial; for it is produced by illicit abstraction.

The procession of the Holy Spirit "ab autroque" does not signify the passage beyond the Dyad, but rather stands for the reabsorption of the Dyad in the Monad and the Monad cannot rely upon itself. At this point, Lossky reveals the weakness of Binitarianism. (I would add, though Lossky does not mention this, that Monad is a fiction because it cannot subsist by itself apart from being incorporated and participating in the triad).

While Lossky's view is of great value in pointing out the deficiency in Roman Catholic Scholastic Theology of Filioque, I consider his view unsatisfactory because he does not answer the problem of the inter-relation of Christology and Pneumatology and certainly no doctrine of God in Christian Theology is satisfactory without this co-relation. He speaks of God in Himself and God in His manifesting energies and explains their inter-relationship by saying "The same Monarchy of the Father, who is the cause of/

/of the Consubstantial Persons of the Son and the Holy Spirit also presides over the manifestation ad extra, of the unity of the Trinity". (P.48). He adds to this statement: "The same monarchy of the Father conditions both the Personal procession of the Holy Spirit (His Personal existence from the Father alone and the manifesting natural procession of the common Godhead, 'ad extra', in the Holy Spirit through the Son". (Ibid. Page 48 f.)

Here Orthodox Theology seems to have developed in its fight against Roman Catholic Scholasticism its own kind of Scholasticism. The whole controversy about Filioque in Lossky's essay is so detached from the problems implied in the New Testament Revelation that the problem of Filioque is meaningless. Only within this context is the discussion of Filioque relevant. Lossky's argument is pertinent to the Scholastic Theology and not to Christian Dogmatics which deals with the problem of ultimate concern and the understanding of the nature of the ultimate concern in terms of the New Testament realities of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

P A R T T H R E E

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

IN

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX, ROMAN CATHOLIC AND REFORMED THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION:

In this final part of the work I propose to discuss the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in Eastern Orthodox Theology under the aspect of Sobornost, in Roman Catholicism under the aspect of 'Juridical Mission of Christ' - or 'Apostolic Hierarchy', and in Reformed Theology under the aspect of the Scriptures as the sole norm of the Church in its faith and life. I consider that each of these three aspects is of central importance to the structure of the Churches which uphold them. The Theology of the Eastern Orthodox Church is only properly understood when we study it in relation to the principles of Sobornost; while Roman Catholic Theology frustrates every student thereof until he realises that it is centred in the principle of 'Juridical Mission of Christ' and approaches it through this principle. What has been said about Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism is pertinent to the Reformed Theology in relation to the principle of the Scriptures, as normative in all dimensions of being which impinges upon the faith of the Church.

To the student of Dogmatics and Church History it is clear that these three principles as individually defined in each of these Christian communities, reveal how the Doctrine and meaning of the Holy Spirit came to be/

be understood in the concrete situation of the Church. The Christian Church is conditioned by history for it came into history because Jesus the Christ lived and died and, as Christians claim, rose from the dead in history, but, nevertheless, the Church claims that history does not determine the Church for its very soul, its guide, is the Holy Spirit. It is the abiding of the Holy Spirit in the Church which determines the nature of the Christian community and distinguishes it from any other community and constitutes it as the Church, the Body of Christ. While historic Christianity agrees in this, the various Christian communities within it differ from each other according to the degree in which these central principles in each of the Churches under discussion express the Lordship and the Guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church. Though the Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Reformed Christianity postulate primacy of the different principles, this does not imply that the Churches which hold them explicitly deny the importance of the others. No Orthodox denies the importance of the principle of "Apostolic Hierarchy" or the pre-eminence of the Scriptures within the Church. Nor do the Roman Catholics deny the principle of Sobornost or the significance of the Scriptures within the Church when they establish the primacy of the "Juridical Mission" of Christ. As for the/

the Reformed Church, those who are inside its fold would be the last to deny the importance of the principles which the Eastern Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Church establish, provided these principles are subordinate to the Scriptures which they regard as the Word of God par excellence which both creates and judges the Church. In the above statements lies relevance, for Christian theology, of work like this.

The reason I have chosen to speak about the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit by discussing these primary principles in the three churches is to stress their distinctive interpretations of this doctrine, and it seems clear to me that this is the only profitable approach, for all three traditions accept the central doctrines of Christianity as binding, and they subscribe to the Trinitarian interpretation of the doctrine of God. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is essentially Christian and not exclusively Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic or Reformed. I have presented an interpretation of this doctrine in order that the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed theology may be judged against the earlier part of this work where I have tried to show that Christology and Pneumatology manifest essential unity and interdependence in the Christian revelation.

The/

The foundation of Christian Theology on the unity of Christology and Pneumatology led to the assertion that in God there is an interrelation of Absolute Unity and Absolute Diversity of three divine hypostases - Father Son and Holy Spirit - which constitute and reveal the personality of God as the existence par excellence and the ground of His own being, and, because of this, the ground of everything that exists since He is the Creator of all. This last statement implies that the principle of primacy within any Church is adequate only so far as it expresses the unity and interdependence of Christology and Pneumatology. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Reformed Theology will reveal its true nature when we examine how far the nature of Sobornost, 'Juridical Mission', and the Scripture as the sole basis of the Church, is favourable or unfavourable to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology.

* * * * *

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE
EASTERN ORTHODOX THEOLOGY.
(THE CHURCH AS SOBORNOST).

THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF SOBORNOST.

1.

In order to bring out the distinctive teaching of the Eastern Orthodox Church on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, one must first ask the question, not how that Church conceives this doctrine, but what it means by the Church. The prevalent answer to this question in the contemporary Eastern Orthodox theology is that the Church is Sobornost. The Russian theologian A.S.Homyakov, to whom the term Sobornost as designation of the Church is ascribed, defined the Church "as the revelation of the Holy Spirit given in the mutual love of Christians, that love which leads them to the Father, through His Beloved Word - Our Lord Jesus Christ".¹ Sobornost is therefore the unity of all those who by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit profess the Lordship of Christ. (I Cor. 12:3). It is not a self-constituted fellowship, but one constituted by the Holy Spirit. To explain this point more fully, it should be added that the Holy Spirit in this connection means the Divine Self of God who abode in Jesus the Christ and in him has entered history. The Holy Spirit is given by Christ to all who receive Christ as their Saviour that He, the Holy Spirit, may make them the partakers of Christ in whom Divine and human are completely united. The meaning/

1.V.A.Palitzkiy: Na Zaprosi Ducha. Petrograd 1914. p.206

meaning of the presence of Christ and the Holy Spirit in human existence is that the believer may participate in God and God in him. The Holy Spirit is The Creator of the new Divine humanity in Christ (i.e. The God-Manhood). This is the Church, the Body of Christ, the pillar and bulwark of the truth. (I Tim. 3:15).

The Church is therefore the union of the empirical world of human history and the transcendent world of God, penetrating each other, centred in Jesus the Christ, created and upheld by the Holy Spirit.

Being an empirical entity the Church has its own history and shares in the history of the world. The Church in order to exist in the world 'arrests' the disruptive forces of the world by fashioning itself into a form of organisation. It is different from purely human organisation, however, since its own organisation is subject to the acknowledgment and expression of the Love of God, in virtue of which true human existence is possible, i.e. its relation to and union with God. Christianity expresses man's response to the agapé of God in worship, missionary and social work in the world. The Church does not exist in the world for its own sake, but for God's sake. (Consequently for the sake of the world). (John 3:16). This is again acknowledgment of God who, in Christ, reveals Himself not as/

as one who arbitrarily asserts Himself against man, to show His superiority, but who seeks man to succour and redeem him from his enslavement to the non-being in himself and in the world. The Church is witness to God that He is both The Creator and the Redeemer of man and the world. The Church is the instrument of Divine Reconciliation in the world. The Fellowship of the Church consists of those who avail themselves of the Reconciliation of God and the world, revealed in Jesus Christ, and who seek to manifest this reconciliation in its Godward and manward direction. This is enacted not by the will of man alone, but by God working in and with human freedom, which receives God into itself to accomplish through man His own purpose. The abiding of God within the realm of human existence, gathered in the Fellowship of the Church, is the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit constitutes the Church in Himself. He is its very soul in whom the Body of Christ, the Church, is conscious of itself as the living organism in a spiritual sense. This organism, though physically subject to death, is spiritually alive, for through the Holy Spirit it already shares in life eternal - the Resurrection of Christ being the pledge of this on earth. Because of this the Church is anxious to preserve its own identity through all its history, in spite of the externally different conditions in history under which Christians in different/

different ages have to live. For the spiritual reality which makes the Church the Church is not subject to the fluctuation and relativity of history. "There is one body and one spirit.... one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4.4:5). In this lies Eastern Orthodox insistence upon tradition, in which it sees the principle of unity of Church with itself through history. The Church is conceived by the Eastern Orthodox as an organism, and they insist rightly that in all stages of its historic development the Church should show the interrelationship and unity of all periods of time built inside the structure of the Church. Were this unity impaired so that it can not recognise itself the Church would have lost identity with itself -- it would cease to be a Church. The tradition preserves the unity of the Church against the vicissitudes of history. The tradition is therefore the life of the Church.

* * * * *

2.

SOBORNOST AND THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH.

Like every organism the Church is self regulating and self developing. Nothing which appertains to the Church is exterior to it. The Church is not subject to any external authority as something imposed upon it from outside./

outside. The striking words of Homyakov which sound almost blasphemy to the ears of Western Christians, express this 'anarchic' principle of the Eastern Orthodox Church most forcefully. "The Church is Authority" says Guizot in one of his works. The Church is not authority as God is not authority, neither is Christ authority, if authority is explained to mean something external. There is no authority, but there is at the same time the truth of a life of a Christian, his inner life, for God, Christ, Church live in him, live in him with life more effective than his heart beating in his breast, or the blood running in his veins; but this is so in so far as he himself lives by the oecumenical (catholic) life of love and unity, i.e. the life of the Church".¹

1. A. Palitzkiy, *ibid.* p. 194

The same passage may be found in German translation in "Östliches Christentum Dokumente ed. Hans Ehrenburg, Vol.I. p.162". "Die Kirche ist die Autorität, bat Guizot in einer seiner beachtenswertesten Werke gesagt, und einer seiner Kritiker führt diese Worte, in dem er sie bestatigt; dabei ahnt keiner von beiden das falsche und Gotteslästerliche, welches darin liegt Armer Lateimer. Armer Protestant! Nein weder Gott, noch Christus, noch die Kirche sind die Autorität, da die Autorität etwas Ausserliches ist. Sie sind die Wahrheit, sie sind das Leben, das innere Leben des Christen, sie sind lebendiger in ihm als das Herz, welches in seiner Brust stägt, und als das Blut, welches in seinen Adern fliesst; aber sie sindes nur in sofern, als er selbst an dem allgemeinen Leben der Liebe und Eintracht, welches eben das Kirckliche Leben ausmacht, teilhat".

v. Also Fr. G. Dejaiffe. S.J. "Sobornost or Papacy?". I in E.C.Q. Vol.X, 1953, p.34 ff. Here an attempt is made by a Roman Catholic theologian to discredit Homyakov's conception of the Church. Roman Catholics find it subconsciously/

Notes: Contd.

subconsciously difficult to forgive Homyakov his views on the interdependence of the charisma of hierarchy and charisma of laity in the Church, implied in his doctrine of the Church. "The gifts of the Holy Spirit are inseparably united in the Holy and living unity", says Homyakov in his famous essay "The Church is One". (p.18) Homyakov's views are opposed to the legalistic conception of the Church. In this he appears to Roman Catholics as an anarchist and a threat.

Here naturally the question arises, how the Church recognises itself; what essential principle is its guide and sign-post to save it from losing the identity of its own nature through the ambiguities of human history. The Orthodox answer is Sobornost. What the Orthodox mean by this term is explained by Fr. Sergius Bulgakov in his book "The Orthodox Church"¹ (p.74 f). "Sobornost is the state of being together. To believe in a Sobornaia church is to believe in a Catholic Church in the original sense of the word, in a Church that assembles and unites: it is also to believe in a Conciliar Church in the sense orthodoxy gives to the term, that is in a Church of the oecumenical councils, as opposed to a purely monarchical ecclesiology. Sobornost also may be translated as 'harmony' 'unanimity'. Orthodoxy, says Homyakov, is opposed both to authoritarianism and to individualism; it is unanimity, a synthesis of authority. It is liberty in Love which unites believers.

The word 'Sobornost' expresses all that".

* * * * *

B.

The Church conceived as Sobornost has no need of an external organ to regulate its existence. Being an organism, containing many members, its principle of unity is/

1. English translation by Elizabeth S. Cram, London. 1935.

is inside and not outside itself. The existence of this organism is regulated by the working together of all its members in unity and interdependence.¹

The Orthodox Church does not recognise the Apostolic authority of its hierarchy or the authority of the Scriptures as something outside and external to itself, regulating its life from the outside, and standing above the Church. Rather it considers them as the expression of its life, Hence Eastern Orthodoxy insists that the Scriptures belong to the tradition of the Church. "The Church has given us the Bible through tradition, and the Reformers themselves received the Bible from the Church and by the Church, that is/

-
1. A.S.Homyakov, "The Church is One", p. 17.
 "The Spirit of God, who lives in the Church, ruling her and making her wise, manifests Himself within her in divers manners; in Scripture, in Tradition, and in Works; for the Church, which does the works of God, is the same Church which preserves tradition and which has written the Scriptures. Neither individuals, nor a multitude of individuals within the Church preserve tradition or write the Scriptures; but the Spirit of God, which lives in the whole body of the Church. Therefore it is neither right nor possible to look for the grounds of tradition in the Scripture, nor for the proof of Scripture in tradition, nor for the warrant of Scripture or tradition in works. To a man living outside the Church neither Scripture nor her tradition nor her works are comprehensible. But to the man who lives within the Church and is united to the Spirit of the Church, their unity is manifested by the grace which lives within her".

is to say, by tradition. It is not for each of us to establish anew the canonicity of Scripture. Each one must discover it for himself, in feeding upon the Word of God, but he must nevertheless receive it as such at the hands of the Church which speaks through tradition".¹ The Scripture is a written form of tradition, which being formed in a canon, has not become something for itself, apart from tradition, but is an inner expression of tradition and its essential nature. Scripture remains the Word of God only because the tradition of the Church (e.g. the life of the Church) continually acknowledges it as an expression of itself, its own self-consciousness continually revealed to the Church and in the Church by the Holy Spirit, who abides in the Church.² For the Orthodox Scripture otherwise would mean accepting the taunt/

1. V. S. Bulgakov. *ibid.* p.22

2. V. A. Palitzkiy: 'Na Zaprosi' Duka p.196.

"Church has composed the Holy Scriptures. The Church gives them life through tradition. In other words and speaking more correctly Scripture and Tradition, these two manifestations of the one and same Spirit, are one manifestation of the Holy Spirit; for Scripture is not anything else but tradition portrayed in writing, and tradition too is nothing else but living Scripture".

taunt of Tertullian "Shutting the Holy Spirit into a Book". This would imply an isolation of the Holy Spirit from the life of the Church, making Him external to the Church and imagining the existence of the Church as the spiritual reality, the Body of Christ, without the Holy Spirit dwelling in it and revealing Himself from within it. The logic of this view also implies that the Church could still remain the Church, while the Holy Spirit acted upon it from the Book which could stand outside the Church and have an 'objective' reality apart from the Church and therefore could stand above the Church.¹

-
1. During my studies in Basel under Professor O. Cullmann, he mentioned that in his discussions in Paris with Roman Catholic theologians, he has been compelled to assert that the establishment of the canon of Scripture by the Church meant ipso facto, subordination of tradition to the Scriptures, and hence the primacy of Scriptures over tradition. What Roman Catholics mean by tradition is argument from the past that the ecclesiastical authority of the Church is above the Church - as Scripture is above the Church in Protestantism. When Eastern Orthodox theologians speak of tradition they mean something different from Roman Catholics. This whole discussion between Protestants and Catholics is alien to Eastern Orthodoxy.

v. O. Cullmann: "Tradition" Zwingli Verlag Zurich, 1954.

vede also in this connection Emil Brunner's book 'The Misunderstanding of the Church', chapter 4. (The Christian fellowship and tradition).

Brunner shows a most ingenious attempt to 'reconcile' Scripture and tradition while safeguarding at the same time the normative nature of the Scriptures for the Church. "But the Scripture is the norm of all dogma, because it crystallises the primary shape of the tradition and hence becomes regulative for the teaching of the Church".
ibid. p.34

The tradition of the Church includes in itself the gift (the charisma) of the Apostolic Ministry, expressed in the life of the Church in the Episcopal succession. While the loss of this charisma would mean for the Church the loss of a vital organ without which the Church would be as a human organism deprived of one of its members which would distort its recognition and identity with its healthy self, the Eastern Orthodoxy, however, does not consider the Apostolic Ministry as ruling the Church from without or existing above the Church as in Roman Catholicism. The primacy and the normative nature of the Apostolic Ministry in the Church would impair its organic structure in the same way as the establishment of the Scriptures, not as an expression of the inner structure of the Church, but as an external canon of its life. In both cases the truth that the Holy Spirit reveals Himself in the Church from within all its charismata, from which none of her members is deprived, is being falsified. When the primacy of one charisma is established as the external principle of authority normative for the rest, there occurs a state of illness in the organism of the Church. (The metaphor of disease in this connection is appropriate). The true and healthy nature of the Church is being threatened and its identity with its ideal self is being impaired. The meaning of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church is precisely to preserve the/

the unity and identity of the Church from within, and save her from seeking the principle of this unity in an 'objectivised' form, which guards it from without. The supremacy of one charisma in the Church over the rest in any legalistic sense is a sin against the Holy Spirit, i.e. the denial that He abides in all charismata of the Church, which work interdependently. The exaltation of the principle of the external authority implies that the Church is conscious of itself not from within itself subjectively, but has exteriorised its subjectivity and delegated it to some 'objective' form which rules it.¹

No/

-
1. The Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology does not engender the situation whereby the Church instead of being in hypostatic dialogue with Christ is engaged in a monologue, which Professor Karl Barth envisages as happening where there is not asserted some 'objectivity' of the witness of the Apostles and prophets, which must stand outside the Church and direct it from within. V. Otto Weber's, Karl Barth's 'Church Dogmatics', p.63.

In the worshipping Church (in the Church conceived as Sobornost) through love and prayer it is not the Church's self centredness, but its heterocentricity, its grounding in Christ through the Holy Spirit which is revealed. In this act, everything in the Church bears witness to this otherness of its grounding, so much so that some of her intrinsic charismata such as the Bible, Sacraments, or Apostolic ministry, for instance, appear as 'external' authorities, i.e. standing above the Church as its norm. On this misunderstanding of the nature of the Church is based the principle of external authority. While Barth is right in pointing out the danger of a monologue, the way he proposes to establish a dialogue often creates only a pseudo dialogue. Against this ambiguity there is only one safeguard, i.e. the experience in worship of the transcendence over the Church, and the immanence in the Church, of Christ revealed by the Holy Spirit. This is God's own act, for as Homyakov puts it: "God Himself prompts prayer and love", i.e. Christian worship.

No organism exists like this. When this moment in its existence happens it is not itself, it has become another organism. It is not identical to itself. It has ceased to be a spiritual entelechy.

* * * * *

0.

Those who establish the principle of the external authority may justify it as a necessary fight for the preservation and the survival of the organism of the Church, which is threatened by the sin and ambiguity in history and human existence, that the Body of Christ, the Church, lives in the world, which is sinful, and so cannot withstand the disruption of sin from within itself except by having an external guardian such as the authority of the Scripture, or the authority of the Hierarchy established by the 'Juridical Mission of Christ'. This is a denial a) that Christ has conquered sin and death in the ontological sense and b) that the Holy Spirit, dwelling in the Church is continually translating this victory of Christ into the existential predicament of the believers. The establishment of the principle of external authority in the Church is re-interpreting Christianity in terms of Old Testament Legalism and is a denial of the revelation of the New Being in Christ. This signifies the loss of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and faith in Him as Lord and Giver of Life in/

in an actual sense. Christian traditions which speak of an "external authority" show a break with the primitive tradition of the Church. The accusation of Eastern Orthodoxy against Roman Catholicism and Protestantism on this point can be supported by the documents of the Ancient Church.

* * * * *

D.

Eastern Orthodoxy does not minimise the meaning of the Scriptures or of the Apostolic Ministry by refusing to see in them an external authority. It knows intuitively that this would mean a denial of the Church as the Body of Christ living by the Holy Spirit: it conceives them as belonging to the inner character of the Church rather than as its external authority. Their true meaning has no need to be supported by theological argument as they are the gifts of God to the Church and the Church realises their value from the depths of its actual experience which no formal teaching, however sublime, could impart. The Holy Spirit in the Church makes His gifts known to those who participate in Him as members of the Church. The dignity of the Apostolic ministry in the Church is exalted by being in mutual interdependence with the rest of the Church, for the Holy Spirit indwells the whole body and the service of those in Apostolic ministry is the service to the holy people of God. 'The authority' of Apostolic ministry thus /

thus conceived surpasses by far the authority of papal infallibility. In Eastern Orthodox Church says Karsawin: "Der Klerus ist von den Laien durch einen besonderen Dienst und durch eine besondere Gnade unterschieden. Aber in Bereich der Lehre im Bereich des Lebens und sogar im Bereich der Theurgie sind die Laien durchaus keine einfash gehorsame Herde wie im Katholizismus. Jeder ist verpflichtet die Last seiner Freiheit zu tragen und night passiv die von den anderen gepredigte Wahrheit anzunehmen sondern sie activ zu suchen".¹

* * * * *

E.

The conception of the Church as the Sobornost is a recognition of its inner spiritual reality (the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church) as its very nature. This is the victory of the Church over the subjection of itself to a principle "beyond itself", such as Papal Infallibility in Roman Catholicism and the authority of the Bible in Protestantism. In these two instances the Church is not in direct hypostatic union with its Head, but with His representatives on the earth, Papacy and the Bible. /

1. Ostliches Christentum II. p. 337

Bible. In the centre of the Roman Catholic and Protestant theology lies Greek dualism, notably that of Aristotle, which lies at the root of Western Christianity. For Sobornost, which is inspired by the spirituality of the Fourth Gospel, (as the whole of the Eastern Orthodoxy Christianity) this dualism is alien. Sobornost understands the return of Christ "on the right hand of the Father" not as the abandonment of the world, after his "juridical mission has been fulfilled" in handing the affairs of the Church to St. Peter, but Christ's sending of the Holy Spirit to translate His victory over death and sin into the sphere of human existence and the world manifesting this as the New Creation - the Church, the Body of Christ. The abiding of the Holy Spirit in the Church means Christ's own abiding in the Church as the Head of the Church. Hence the absurdity of the conception of His representatives as external authorities. The principle of papal authority and Biblical authority as defined by the Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively is a denial of the Abiding of the Holy Spirit in the Church and if this is too strong a charge, then certainly Roman Catholicism and Protestantism in practice deny implicitly the unity of Christology and Pneumatology, and subordinate Pneumatology to Christology. The ontological basis of this may be found in the doctrine of/

of God as the Trinity, based upon the Filioque.

* * * * *

IS SOBORNOST ANARCHY?

(Sobornost and Eschatology).

For the legalistic mind of the Western Christianity the conception of the Church as Sobornost may appear abstract and 'anarchic'. Are there no visible sign-posts of concrete historic nature, by which the Church may be guided, it may be asked. The answer is Yes. "The sign-posts" of this kind are those elements of Church tradition, through which the Church recognises the work and the identity of the same Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church. (In them also the Church recognises its identity with itself). Such are the Holy Scriptures, the Great Creed of the Church, the Nicene Constantinopolitan and other creeds, and the dogmatic decisions of the Oecumenical Councils. But these are not above the Church or external to it, they are expressions of the same Church. They are not in any way to be isolated from the other aspects of the Church's life, in which the Church unmistakably recognises its own identity with itself in spite of ambiguities and contingency in history. The ground of this identity is the Holy Spirit by whom the Church is in the wholeness of its historic existence being gathered into the/

the revelation of God in Christ which is the inner content and meaning of the Church.¹ "Therefore it is obvious", says N. Glubokovsky, "that for the Eastern Orthodox, Christianity is not primarily a doctrine but a life of communion with God in Christ and the creation of the new being by the Holy Spirit within the whole koinonia of the believers, whereby in the unity of faith in Christ, they are made by him the adopted children of the Heavenly Father and consequently they become by grace brethren amongst/

-
1. A. S. Chomyakow: Ostliches Christentum Vol.I. p. 166

"Die Fülle des kirchlichen Gerstes ist weder etwas Kollektives noch etwas Abstractes, sie ist der Geist Gottes, der sich selbst kennt und sich nicht fremd sein kann. Die Kirche, in diesem Sinne verstanden, die ganze Kirche ist es, welche die heilige Schrift verfasst hat und diese in der Tradition fortleben lässt; oder die Überlieferung, diese beiden Manifestationen desselben Geistes, sind eigentlich nur Eine, denn die heilige Schrift ist die geschriebene Tradition und die Tradition ist die lebendige Schrift".

v. Also A. Palitzkiy op. cit. p. 196 (Russian).

amongst themselves".¹ Glubokovsky on the basis of what he has said above, explains why the sacramental side of the life in the Church has such a dominant character. This is because the sacraments embrace the whole being of man so completely and organically that through them the all embracing nature of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church is experienced by believer with the wholeness of his personality.²

The intense experience of the Pneumatological nature of the Church within Eastern Orthodoxy explains (what is most difficult for Protestants to accept) the claim for the Church as being sinless even here and now.³ Eastern Orthodox experience and theology concerning the Church have an/

1. A. Palitzkiy, op. cit. p. 108.

2. "The sacraments are not external symbols, nor ritual accessories, created, expanded and shortened according to convenience, but they are sine qua non stream of the Christian life, provided for the Church by hierarchical ministry, and duly received from The Lord and Saviour".
N. Glubokovsky ibid.

3. The nature of this claim of the infallibility of the Church may be illustrated from the following quotation taken from Russian theologian N. Arsenew: "From the Spirit of God derives the whole life of the Church. He is the source of her knowledge. Moreover, if the object of our religious knowledge is God, the bearer, the subject of true religious knowledge is also only God (I Cor. 2.11:12). We know God by the Spirit of God who is given to us in the Church. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of truth and knows no error; therefore the Church, whose foundation of life, the soul-giving element, source and subject of knowledge is the Spirit of/

Notes: Contd.

of God, is infallible. It is not that separate members or the groups of members of the Church that are infallible, but the whole body of the Church; for the truth is given in holiness, and the knowledge of truth is combined with the moral effort and the fullness of infallible knowledge of truth is given only in the fullness of holiness. This fullness of holiness does not possess this or that man, nor this or that separate group of the Church upon the earth, but the whole Church in its wholeness - only the Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of Holiness and Who abides in the Church".

Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism, p.22 ff.(In Russian).

an eschatological imprint, (which comes from understanding the Church essentially as pneumatic reality), and here perhaps the Eastern Orthodox err in not allowing sufficiently for the ambiguities of empirical human existence where sin is still to be overcome existentially. (It has been conquered by Christ in reality since it no longer has ultimacy over man as was the case with pre-Christian man). The Protestants err in the other direction.

* * * * *

THE REVELATION OF SOBORNOST IN THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH.

The understanding of the Church by the Eastern Orthodox as an organism - the Body of Christ - in the way indicated above comes to the Eastern Orthodox Christian from experience of worship, chiefly in liturgical worship, which is essentially Pneumatocentric, and in it is the foretaste of the Kingdom of God as an eschatological reality, for the Holy Spirit gathers all things into Christ and reveals Christ as the Head of the New Creation. The unity of the Church is here comprehended as its reality. Here the sting of temporality and death in human existence is taken away by the victory of the Church through the Holy Spirit given to the Church by Christ. By the Holy Spirit the Church is made the New Creation in Christ. In the worship of the Church the theonomy of the New Creation/

Creation is revealed not as an external authority but as its truth, its very life. Nothing is external to the Church for it is immanent in the Love of God as revealed in Christ and made actual in the experience of the believer as a member of the Church who partakes in the Holy Spirit. The agapē nature of the New Creation here is revealed. Agapē knows no external authority: it reveals in the Church the mystery of the Divine life of the Holy Trinity, as mutual sacrifice one on behalf of the other and the joy of the self-relatedness and unity of its being, which is created not by self-seeking but seeking the other. The divine theonomy of the New Creation in Christ revealed in the worship of the Church, manifests the inwardly harmonised nature of the Church.¹ The Klyros of the Church and the laity are caught up in this theonomy which is expressed in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Any claim of an external authority is here unthinkable, for God, who gives all in Christ and the Holy Spirit, does not claim any external authority./

1. By this is meant simultaneous action of all parts in creating the unity of the whole, from which the separate parts receive the meaning and stability. The whole upholds individual parts for it is upheld by them.

authority. As the Church here receives God's love, it renounces itself in freedom to Him and seeks all for God's glory and nothing for itself. Here God and man really unite, but not in the Pantheistic sense of merging into each other, for the Love which unites them reveals also the difference between them. The infinite character of the God-like nature of man in Christ co-existing with his utter creatureliness is understood better in the Eastern Orthodox than any other Christian tradition. This arises from the Pneumatocentric nature of Christ and the Church. Only this Pneumatocentricity could reveal the meaning of Divine Love, the mystery of what the Russian theologian S.L.Frank¹ calls 'Panentheism,' where God reveals from within Himself man, not as the modus of His Being but as the other to whom His love is directed and who has a freedom and hypostasis of his own, (which God bestows upon him) and thus man is able to receive Divine agapē and surrender his own being to it in gratitude as an act of worship and service to God and by this show that he possesses the agapē which enables him to love God and his fellow men.

1. v. S.L.Frank 'God with Us', p.79 ff.

To the Greeks that God could love man was unthinkable for Love (Eros) is essentially want and need. God is plenitude and cannot know or generate love. In Christian religion the whole conception of the Love of God is differently comprehended.

SOBORNOST AS THE UNITY OF ALL BELIEVERS
IN CHRIST THROUGH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

(The Mystery of Worship)

By the pneumatic character of worship in the Eastern Orthodox Church the believer experiences the presence of all Christians, the living as well as the dead with him in worship. The past of the Church is not something detached from the Church's life in the present. The revelation through worship of the presence of the Holy Spirit, in whom Christ is contemporaneous with us and we with Him, reveals the co-presence spiritually of all those who have lived in the Church and whose participation in the life of the Spirit makes them one with the believers who are still alive. The presence of the Icons in the Eastern Orthodox Church is a symbolic attempt to express to the worshipper the unity and co-presence in worship of all those whose life is hidden with God in Christ by the Holy Spirit living in the Church in all her members regardless of time and space. The Holy Spirit who gathers all things in Christ, makes them present in the Church in which He dwells, revealing the Presence and mystery of Christ. In the presence of the Holy Spirit in worship, the beauty of holiness of the New Creation in Christ is experienced.¹

1. Paul Florensky in one of his sermons called 'Radost na Vyeki', Sergius Posad, 1907, describes something of this/

Notes: Contd.

this experience in following words: "My Brethren, if you only realised how beautiful are all of you. Is it not to the Holy Spirit who dwells in you that the priest offers worship when he turns to you with incense..... Has not a man in him divine likeness? As behind the paint and wood of an icon there lies hidden secret divine grace, so also behind the Body of man and his sinful soul, lives in inner temple - in much seeing conscience - the Holy Spirit".

(Professor Karl Barth in his book 'The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life', p. 81, says: "In the Holy Spirit we have conscience Syneidēsis, con-scientia... 'co-knowledge' along with God about what is good and evil: who should have this unless it be the child of God who is continually being regenerated by the Word?"

Iconoclasm is described as Christological heresy because Iconoclasm denies that the Church, the New Creation, is translucent here and now to the Holy Spirit, which is the fruit of the Incarnation, the consequences of the Word being made flesh. Yet Iconoclasm is essentially a Pneumatological heresy (though, of course Pneumatology and Christology are not to be separated). The Communion of Saints which is essential to the Sobornost is lived as an actual experience of the believer, as an intense reality present in Eastern Orthodox worship.

It goes without saying that when the Orthodox speak of Sobornost, they do not mean only the unity of those believers who are alive in history, but also the dead. The Church can and indeed must regulate its historic life according to the demand of a historic situation of a given time. The formulation of its teaching, its missionary and social activities, may be expressed in a form best fitting the need of a given historic epoch. But behind this external difference, the identity with its essential spiritual nature, as expressed in the past, must be safeguarded. The Church has always identity with itself in spite of its expanding experience and growth in history; as a man who in his sixties recognises the continuity of the same personality which was present in him in his youth, developed, enriched, conditioned differently in different stages of his/

his life, and yet, behind it, the same reality persisting and manifesting itself. The Church for Eastern Orthodoxy is an entelechy in a spiritual sense. The mystery of this reality Eastern Orthodox theologians explain as the hypostatic union of the Church and its Head, the Christ, created, revealed and maintained by the Holy Spirit.¹

1. Though the book of Revelation has only received a silent approval by the Eastern Orthodox Church, even the most unscholarly amongst the Eastern Orthodox, through his experience of Eastern Orthodox worship, realises that this book has been inspired by and came from the experience of Christian worship, in which lies the key of its understanding as New Testament scholars now increasingly recognise. (v. Especially O. Cullman, "Early Christian Worship" and Otto Pieper, an article on the liturgical character of the Book of Revelation in the American Journal of Church History, three years ago, which unfortunately I have not been able to use for this thesis).

The striking identity of experience of worship described in the Book of Revelation and the experience in Eastern Orthodox worship, may explain what the Eastern Orthodox mean by the tradition as the life of the Church and the principle of identity of the Church with itself through history: and also why the Eastern Orthodox comprehends the Church as the revelation of unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

A.

COSMIC NATURE OF SOBORNOST.

The Sobornost which is the creation of the Holy Spirit is not only the reconciliation of man and God and man with man, but is also spiritual reconciliation of man and nature.¹ The spiritual experience of this is interwoven in the structure of the Orthodox spirituality. This again is expressed in the Orthodox worship where the bread and the wine, candle lights, incense, and water, are used as an expression that the New Creation in Christ is not only redemption of man but also of nature (Rom. 8:18); for the Eastern Orthodox Pneumatology implies both anthropology and cosmology. This is because the mystery of Incarnation manifests itself (a) as a concern of a man for history, whose meaning is bound up with the God-man Jesus/

1. Bulgakov, *ibid.* p. 75 To translate 'Sobornost' I have ventured to use the French word "conciliarite" which must be used both in a restricted sense (The Church of the Councils), and in a larger sense (The Church Catholic, oecumenical). The best rendering of Sobornost in the language of the New Testament is the word (Preconciliation (II Cor. 5:18). It is a pity that Eastern Orthodox theologians did not interpret the meaning of Sobornost in terms of the great passage in II Cor. 5. 17-21, for it is there where the New Testament expresses the ontological depths of the reality which Sobornost denotes as this is revealed within actual experience of the Church.

Jesus the Christ, and (b) is also cosmic, for nature participates in the act of redemption through the Holy Spirit who by Christ dwells in the world (i.e. His abiding in the Church gathering all things in Christ). Eastern Orthodox theology speaks of the Transfiguration of the Cosmos which is the counterpart of the deification of man, (as a result of man's being gathered in Christ by the Holy Spirit, who reveals believer in Christ and Christ in believer in their hypostatic union.¹

The/

-
1. The doctrine of the deification of man, which was an attempt of the Greek Fathers to formulate a Christian doctrine of man, is still an essential part of Eastern Orthodox Theology. The concern with the problem of Anthropology in Eastern Orthodox theology implied in the teaching about deification of man, shows that Eastern Orthodox theological thought is an expression of the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. To describe Eastern Orthodox teaching about deification of man as pagan in origin, as once I heard from Professor T.F. Torrance of Edinburgh University while addressing the Theological Society of the University of Glasgow, indicates the loss of theological contact with Eastern Orthodox thought. (Professor Torrance referred to the origin of the doctrine of deification of man as coming from the Odessey of Homer, when Odysseus was cast on the island before Nausicaa. On the contrary, this point in Eastern Orthodox theology reveals richer and fuller understanding of Christian revelation. I am sure this doctrine will be increasingly appreciated by contemporary theology which is concerned with Christian doctrine of man.

The feast of the Transfiguration of Christ (Mark 9:1) is held by the Eastern Orthodox Church and is considered of very great spiritual significance. In the Transfiguration of Christ, the Eastern Orthodox Church sees the revelation of the pneumatic character of Christ, and Creation's sharing in that revelation. The Creation also contains and in and through Christ manifests its pneumatophoric nature.¹

The cosmological character of Sobornost is implied in the spirituality of the Eastern Orthodox theologians and/

-
1. According to Thomas Aquinas, Transfiguration also has a pneumatic character. "Thus in a special sense a mission of the Holy Ghost was directed to Christ.... at the time of His Baptism by the figure of a dove, a fruitful animal, to show forth in Christ the authority of the Giver of Grace by spiritual regeneration..... The Transfiguration showed it forth in the appearance of a bright cloud, to show the exuberance of doctrine; and here it was said, Hear ye Him (Matt. 17:5).

The Summa Theologica. Quest. XLIII. art. VII.
In edition of Dominicans English Translation.
London, 1912. Part one, second number p. 205.

and bursts out in their writings as the expression of some subconscious deeply rooted reality; wherever they discuss the problem of the relationship of God and man.¹

The problem of the pneumatological conception of creation is implied in the pneumatic character of the Incarnation.² This raises the problem of the Cosmic Christ. The need for a theology of this kind is acutely felt amongst Protestants as well as the Eastern Orthodox. The Russian Sophiologists, Solovyov, Florensky, and Bulgakov, have attempted to formulate the theology of cosmic significance of Sobornost. The speculative nature of their thought is obscure and difficult to follow.³

1. "Die Orthodoxie ist sich der Zweieinheit des Menschen mit Gott und der All-Einheit der Kreatur tiefer bewusst". Karsawin, *ibid.* p. 332
2. "The Orthodox believe that the Church has received from the Holy Spirit the power to sanctify and purify all life, both matter and spirit, and wherever she operates through her members, the creation is brought under the sway of the Holy Spirit and becomes the vehicle of His life giving and saving influence".
 n Nicolas Zervlov: "The Church of the Eastern Christians", p. 51. London S.P.C.K., 1942.
3. Alexis van der Mensbrugghe: "From Dyad to Triad. London, 1935. An essay in which an attempt is made to formulate the theology of Sophianism.
 Also Eugeny Lampert: The Divine Realm. Faber & Faber, London, 1943.

follow yet, on that account, the problem which Sophiologists try to answer is not to be considered unimportant. The appearance of Alan Galloway's book 'The Cosmic Christ' shows that there exists a real concern amongst Protestants to relate and incorporate the anthropologic and historic revelation of God in Christ and the Holy Spirit to and with its cosmological nature. The theology of Cosmic Christ would be of great help in the discussion of the relationship between science and religion.¹ A meaningful theology of the Cosmic Christ may be created by taking as its basis the synthesis and interrelationship of Christology and Pneumatology. A theology of this kind which is based on the pre-Christian conception of the Logos and its impersonalistic nature is alien to the New Testament revelation and it concerns the philosophy of theism rather than Christian theology.

-
1. It is not surprising that Florensky who was great mathematician (whose genius as a mathematician even the Soviet Communist government has recognised) accepted Sophianism and was one of its chief exponents.

SOBORNOST AS THE UNITY OF CHRISTOLOGY AND PNEUMATOLOGY.

Before we leave our study of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Eastern Orthodox theology, it seems relevant to mention briefly the possibilities for the further development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Eastern Orthodoxy. Unfortunately, there is not very much written in recent Eastern Orthodox theology on the subject of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, apart from the great work of Sergius Bulgakov, 'The Comforter' (already mentioned in this thesis). But the theology of the Holy Spirit in the Eastern Orthodox Church has very great possibilities, for the basis of real and constructive Pneumatology is there - the unity and organic interrelation of Christology and Pneumatology is maintained. All Eastern Orthodox spirituality is based upon it. That is why Eastern Orthodoxy mystifies other Christian communities who try to assess the nature of Orthodoxy from the standpoint of Pneumatology subordinated to and controlled by Christology; both are in consequence distorted. This means that when the Eastern Orthodox theology is judged from the standpoint of a particular theological position(e.g. the 39 Articles, the Westminster Confessions) difficulties naturally arise and the theological rapprochement with the Eastern Orthodox is frustrated. The search for a theology based upon the/

the unity of Christology and Pneumatology is a search for the oecumenicity of the Church, for such a theology engenders the possibility of the meeting of Christians 'in the Spirit', and does not demand from the other to subscribe to one's own normative theology as the 'principle of authority' which, in fact, is only a substitute for reality.¹ Thus the New Testament agapē, which underlies all Christian doctrine, Christian life and everything, is precluded from manifesting its unconditional nature. In its place Christians demand from each other to accept and meet on the basis of an external principle which, being 'objective' and static, precludes revelation of the transcendent depths in the meeting of the followers of Christ in Christ Himself. Because of this, when Christians meet together to deal with the concrete problems of the world and the problem of their own 'Sobornost' in the/

-
1. The trouble of the so-called normative theology such as that of Thomas Aquinas, Calvin's, and of the Protestant Confessions of Faith, is that these 'normative theologies' were necessitated to arrest the theological and spiritual confusion created by the break in unity and interdependence of Christology and Pneumatology. In consequence these normative theologies embody in themselves to various degrees this cleavage between Christology and Pneumatology, which they very often bridge only artificially.

the world, there is often absence of inspiration and sense of destiny, which Christ has given to His followers by the Holy Spirit abiding in the Church.

I am not suggesting that Eastern Orthodox Christians have no faults, for they very often run counter to other Christians with their own 'weapons' of authority when their fellow Christians scrutinise them by external principles of authority, whether it be the authority of the Pope or that of the Scriptures. But it is true that for the Eastern Orthodox Christians the full and meaningful unity is that which derives from true Pneumatology, from an understanding of the unity and mutuality of Christ and the Holy Spirit, where each reveals the other, not as His own *modus* but as the other by whom and in whom the Being of the other is hidden and revealed through God the Father, in whom they, both Christ and the Holy Spirit, love each other and in whom the Father is loved and revealed.

Due to this intense awareness of the immanence of God to man and man's transcendence of his own human situation by the presence of God in his history, the Eastern Orthodox Christian tends to concentrate sometimes rather too exclusively on Divine Transcendence so that His immanence in the world, which should mean their concern with the world, is lacking. Eastern Orthodox theology is/

is increasingly recognising that on this point it is wrongly expressing the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, for it is breaking the unity of Christology and Pneumatology. It is losing here the full implication of its most essential doctrine of God-man, Jesus the Christ, and tends towards Monophysitism. Owing to this the meaning of the Holy Spirit becomes distorted, for the Holy Spirit reveals Himself fully in God-man, Jesus the Christ, whom also the Holy Spirit reveals as Son of the Father.¹ That is why the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit has meaning only where Christ is understood as the revelation of God the Father in an absolute sense, Himself revealing and being also revealed by the Holy Spirit who reveals Son to the Father and the Father to the Son in the unity of the Triune God/

-
1. In the Church conceived as Sobornost, the Holy Spirit unites in Himself and reconciles polarities within being to each other, such as supernatural and natural, eternal and temporal, universal and particular, not merging them into an undifferentiated monad, but disclosing their mutuality and revealing each being to itself as a complex entity, theonomous in character and because of this, self-related, living, self-revealing, all-embracing, not by its 'essence', but by the Holy Spirit within it, in whom the being reaches the status of personality, which in Love surrenders itself to God as a recognition of its existence as theonomous.

God. This is the act of the Divine Sobornost revealed in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit in fashioning God's New Creation in Christ, the Church, gives it self-understanding through the Holy Spirit as Sobornost. The conception of Sobornost is the Eastern Orthodox way of understanding the unity of God and all things created by Him in the Son and upheld in Him by the Holy Spirit.

Pneumatology is the basis of the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of 'panentheism', which is another name for the Kingdom of God. The Church is the manifestation that in Christ and the Holy Spirit personality recognises and accepts its theonomous nature. It was the experience of Church as Sobornost, i.e. the pneumatic centre of being revealed in Christ, that V. Troitzkiy says: "Only in life of the Church the concrete personality of man could live and develop itself!"¹

If we were to chose one particular passage of the New Testament by which the meaning of Sobornost is best illustrated, the 12th. and 13th Chapters of I Epistle to Corinthians would claim primacy.

* * * * *

1. V. Palitzkiy, *ibid.* p. 206

HISTORIC BACKGROUND TO THE DOCTRINE OF SOBORNOST.

There is no doubt whatever that the formulation of the Doctrine of the Church in terms of Sobornost, (because of the pneumaphoric nature of the whole body of the Church) is a great advancement to the understanding of the nature and the meaning of the Church, for every understanding of the Church is inadequate if it is not experienced by the believer as an inner reality in which all its members and charismas are each indispensable and irreplaceable.

This formulation of the Church appears in the New Testament writings, in the Didache, and in Justin Martyr, where there is no division into the 'clerical' and 'lay' part in the Church which was to be found later. There is found a difference of charismatic gifts, yes, but not division.

After the time of Constantine, the Emperor symbolically represented the laity in the Church, and the charisma which belonged to the laity was vested in him. For the East there has been this reciprocity and mutuality between the laity represented in the Emperor and Apostolic hierarchy or Kleros. This naturally has had a negative influence for the Eastern Church has tended to overlook the laity except as seen in their representatives who bore authority over them. (In the West the subordinate position of the laity had been established early on owing to the fall of the/

the Western Empire, and when the Empire was re-established the secondary place of the laity in the Church was an accepted fact.) Consequent on the political and social structure of society in the Eastern Orthodox world the chief factors within the Church became the hierarchy and the representatives of the Emperor (i.e. civil magistrates). This happened in Byzantium and later reappeared in Russia.

The two chief occasions in the history of the Eastern Orthodox Church in which the laity re-asserted its lost responsibilities in the Church, were the attempt at Union of the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church in Lyons, (1274) and Florence (1439). The decrees of these councils never came into existence, as the Church as a whole refused to accept them in spite of their support by the emperor and the greater number of hierarchy.

The fall of a great part of the Eastern Orthodox world under Mohammedan rule when it became subject to an un-Christian Emperor, left the Church dominated in part by hierarchy because of political interference in its affairs, but the laity again took active part to some extent in the Church as the Church had to lean heavily on them.

When one considers the historic situation in which the Eastern Orthodox Church existed, it is indeed most significant that the idea of the Church as Sobornost was preserved/

preserved, for there were in the history of the Eastern Orthodox Church many forces working in the opposite direction. Some of these forces came from within the area of the Eastern Orthodox world and others were an impact from outside. (In the latter case I am particularly thinking of the influence which Western Christendom, Roman Catholic and Protestant exerted, i.e. the appearance of various uniate Churches amongst the Eastern Orthodox was due to the Roman Catholic impact upon them, while the appearance in Eastern Orthodox Church of the Confessions of Faith such as those of Patriarch Cyril Lukar was due to the impact of Protestantism). Thus, for instance, such progressive theologians as the late S. Bulgakov betray a sentimental regret for the time when the Christian Emperor (Ozar) took an active interest in the welfare of the Church "as the Bishop and Guardian of the Church from the outside". (The title of 'the Bishop from without' was introduced into the Church by Constantine the Great). An Emperor who represented the laity and manifested to the Church the charisma of its lay members, however admirable, was an offence against Sobornost and its disappearance should not be regretted. The charisma which belongs to the laity cannot be delegated, and deviation in the past should be rectified by fidelity to the concept of the Church/

Church as Sobornost in its fullest sense.

Some Eastern Orthodox theologians while in principle accepting the concept of the Church as Sobornost narrow its meaning by interpreting Sobornost as the Unity of the Fellowship of the Twelve Apostles, which unity is perpetuated in the Church through the Apostolic Succession and immanent in the Church in the Fellowship of the Episcopate which rules the Church. This view which is due to the impact of Roman Catholicism upon the Eastern Church, may be illustrated from a passage in an essay by the Russian theologian George Florovsky which deals with Sobornost. "The Church is unity of charismatic life. The source this unity is hidden in The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and in the Sacrament of Pentecost, that unique descent of the Spirit of Truth into the world. Therefore the Church is an Apostolic Church. It was created and sealed by the Spirit in the Twelve Apostles and the Apostolic succession is a living mysterious thread binding the whole historical fullness of Church life into one Catholic whole. Here again we see two sides. The objective side is the uninterrupted sacramental succession, the continuity of hierarchy. The Holy Ghost does not descend upon earth again and again, but abides in the 'visible' and historical Church. And it is in the Church/

Church that He breathes and sends forth His rays. Therein lies the fullness of the Catholicity of Pentecost".¹

In regard to what G. Florovsky says above, it must be pointed out that if the Pentecost is taken as decisive creative factor of the Church (as it surely must be taken), the Church in Pentecost is not sealed in the Twelve Apostles but rather the Apostolic nature of the Church is confirmed and established, and the Apostolate of the Church is made an inner characteristic of the Church. This may at first sight appear a verbal and not a real issue. On the contrary. From the earliest Christian tradition, as we gather from the New Testament, the Apostolic Fellowship of/

-
1. G.V. Florensky: Sobornost: The Catholicity of the Church. (An essay in) The Church of God - an Anglo-Russian Symposium. S.P.C.K. London, 1934.

v. also G. Dejaifve S.J. "Sobornost and Papacy" II. E.C.Q. Vol. X, 1953, p. 78 ff., where an attempt is made by Roman Catholic theologian to defend Eastern Orthodox from falling into the error of Homyakov and Bulgakov conception of Sobornost, by claiming that the views of Dr. Florensky are more 'in conformity with the classical Orthodox Thesis'. Ultimately Florensky disturbs Dejaifve when Florensky advocates that in those cases where the appeal to the past does not offer any guidance and that in such cases "we must put our trust in general Christian consensus and understanding of the flock of Christ". Dejaifve claims that this last arbitrium belongs to the pastors of the Church embodied in papal infallibility.

of the Twelve does not contain the whole Church in itself. If this were so the Lord's Supper would not be hidden in and bound up with the Pentecost, as the meaning of the doctrine of Epiclesis in the Eastern Orthodox Church implies, but would be sufficient in itself. (What I mean here is that the disciples of Jesus understood the significance of the Last Supper only after the Pentecostal experience). The Church perpetuates the Apostolic Succession and acknowledges its charisma as one of the signs of its identity from within itself. This precludes Apostolic Succession from being an external principle of authority.¹ The view of Father Florovsky, as it stands, leads precisely to postulating Apostolic Succession as an external principle of authority. His interpretation of Sobornost tends to conflict with that of Homyakov and implies primacy of the clerical principle, and as such alien to the Orthodox spirituality which is the soul of its ecclesiology.

* * * * *

1. 'La Sobornost ne contredit pas le principe fondamental de la hierarchie institue par Dieu lui meme, mais il lui assigne la place qui lui Revient dans L'Eglise et non au dessus de L'Eglise et il l'explique comme l'organisation propre de La Sobornost'.

(Thesen uber die Kirche No. 5 in Proces du Congres d'Athenes p. 130. Quoted by G. Dejaive ibid.p.83. This congress was a representative body of Eastern Orthodox theologians who met in Athens in 1935).

The problem of ecclesiology in modern Eastern Orthodox theology is by no means simple. At present there are several schools of thought of which three are prominent. The first one may be called traditionalist and stresses the historic approach. It makes this or that period of Church history as normative in expressing the right doctrine of the Church. (To this group belong G. Florovsky who takes as his point of departure the theology of the Greek Fathers, and Vladimir Lossky whose thought express renaissance of the Orthodox Middle Ages, i.e. Simeon the New Theologian (d.c. 1040) and Gregory Palamas (d. 1360). Lossky's theology is a mixture of mysticism and rationalism as in the whole Byzantine period of that period).

The second approach to the problem of ecclesiology is less historic but theologically much more comprehensive. It seeks to formulate the problem of ecclesiology in terms of the nature of revelation. (Homyakov¹, Florovsky, Bulgakov, N. Berdyaev).

The third approach is an attempt at the synthesis of these two. In this country the writings of Nicolas Zernov may be described as expressing this point of view.

The common principle of all these movements is the acceptance/

1. v. Serge Bolshakoff: The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in Khomyakov and Mochter. London S.P.C.K. 1946

acceptance of the idea of Sobornost as central to any formulation of the doctrine of the Church. This common agreement is based on the fact that they all see in the idea of Sobornost, which implies the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as essential to any understanding of the nature of the Church as the divine human union in Christ brought about by the Holy Spirit, the only right approach to ecclesiology.

* * * * *

APPENDIX.

Teaching of Paul Florensky about the Holy Spirit.

(This teaching is expressed in the fifth letter of his famous book (in Russian): 'The Pillar and Bulwark of Truth' - Moskva, 1914. The abbreviated form of the same may be found in German "Östliches Christentum Documente" - ed. Hans Ehrenburg - München, 1925).

* * * * *

THE PILLAR AND BULWARK OF TRUTH.

(The Comforter. p. 109 ff).

The knowing of Truth, i.e. the essential nature of the Holy Trinity, is brought about through the Grace of the Holy Spirit. All human existence inspired by Truth and directed towards Truth is the act of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the nearest and most intimate reality for him who strives towards Truth.

But even Christian life, apart from its higher ascents, and the ordinary life of the Church, not counting those of her members chosen by Heaven, knows very little, and only in a vague sort of way, about the Holy Spirit, as a Person. This is accompanied by insufficient knowledge concerning the divine nature of creation, for knowledge of the Holy Spirit would reveal the full Spirit-bearing character of its deification. Then history would have come to an end: the fullness of time (*kaipos*) would reveal itself. And in the whole creation there would be no time.

But so long as there is history, there is only a possibility of a momentary illumination by the Spirit: there is only knowledge of the Comforter by particular men in particular instants, and then they are lifted above the time - into Eternity. 'There is no time for them', for history has come to an end. The fullness of the Spirit's appropriation is not accessible to the believers in general as it is not accessible to the individual believer in the entirety of his life. The Christ's victory over death and corruption has not yet been fully appropriated by the Creation, therefore there is not as yet the fullness of its knowledge. Holy Spiritual illuminations are a pledge to the mind of the Spirit's presence, i.e. the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the nature of the soul. In so far as there is no Resurrection, as yet there is no full rational illumination by the Holy Spirit. Those who say otherwise share the untruth of Manes, Montanus, etc.

The Holy Spirit abides and is active in the Church. But the knowledge of Him, has been only a pledge to - or rather the reward - in particular situations experienced by particular men. And it will be so until all is accomplished according to God's purpose revealed in Christ. All Fathers of the Church and mystical philosophers speak about/

about the importance of the idea of the Spirit in Christian understanding of existence, but almost none says anything definite and concrete about the Holy Spirit. It is clear that the Fathers know themselves grasped by the Spirit, but it is clear also that this knowledge cannot be communicated, for at the same time it remains a mystery. Those amongst them who were directed towards systematising Christian faith in dogmatic form, had to speak positively about the Holy Spirit, and yet in them we see the poverty of positive statements, in spite of the fact that they experienced and abundantly partook of the mystery of the Spirit whom they felt present in the Christian Church and the life of believers.

This is, says Florensky, obvious in the patristic literature. The Pneumatology of the Fathers is somewhat artificial: it is created analogically, namely, "Concerning the Son is said such and such thing therefore concerning the Holy Spirit we say also such and such thing".

In the formulation of Christology, theologians, while working out their schematic formulations, had in history and human experience a direct revelation of the Word, and that made their task easier - argument was secondary. In regard to the Holy Spirit the argument was almost the main thing; without it the teaching about the Holy Spirit would be deprived of its meaning and relevance.

The same undefined references we find in the liturgical life of the Church. Thus, for instance, in the prayers used in the Eastern Church on the Day of Pentecost (called in the Eastern Church, the Day of the Holy Trinity) the prayers to the Father and the Son are definitive in their phrasing. They speak positively about the Father and the Son, while the prayer to the Holy Spirit bears the marks of indefiniteness (except that it denotes the Divine Nature of the Holy Spirit along with the Father and the Son). Florensky says that while the positive Theology and liturgical life of the Church have not much to say about the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit manifests Himself to the saints, revealing Himself in and through their body and soul and surrounding them. p.120 Here Florensky follows the teaching of Origen, who delimits the manifestations of the Holy Spirit to the Saints. And even the Saints do not speak of Him as 'hypostasis', but rather as the Divine Power. This is not surprising, says Florensky, as the revelation of the Holy Spirit as Hypostasis does not belong to the age of history, though the/

the Holy Spirit stands behind everything which makes Christian life a reality. His 'age' has broken into the world in Christ, and in the Holy Spirit all generations of Christians share, but none of them will witness the knowledge of His Hypostasis until the end, when He will be revealed to all, so that there should be no perfection of one generation without the rest. Florensky describes the Revelation of God as the gradual disclosure of God - first of the Father, second of the Son, and thirdly of the Holy Spirit. In this he is very near to Joachim of Flora, except that the revelation of the Holy Spirit does not belong for him to history, as in Joachim. Florensky quotes the theologian Gregory of Nyssa, as advocating gradual revelation of the hypostatic God (p. 134 ff). To Florensky the idea of the Kingdom of God and the Holy Spirit is linked together. The full revelation of their nature is eschatological, not in the sense that they are above history as alien to it, but being in history, gathering history in themselves, where the transcendent nature of history is revealed from within itself.

The teaching about the Holy Spirit as the Kingdom of the Father is implicit in the Gospels, and in St. Paul is spoken of explicitly. Florensky quotes the testimony of Gregory of Nyssa, who says that in the Ancient Church the words of the Lord's Prayer (Mt. 6-10, Lk. 11-12) 'Our Father..... Thy Kingdom come' read: 'Our Father, let Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.' In this lies the clue to the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa, that the Holy Spirit is the Kingdom of God. Gregory of Nyssa develops the teaching about the Holy Spirit as the Kingdom of the Father and the anointing of the Son. The Father manifests Himself as the King, which means in the Holy Spirit the Kingly Majesty of the Father finds its rest. And also, from eternity, the begotten Son receives in the Holy Spirit the Kingly Glory which belongs to the Father. The Holy Spirit crowns the Son with glory. This is the anointing action of the Spirit. And if the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father is the Kingdom, in relation to the Son He is The Anointing, the Charisma. (According to Gregory of Nyssa the name Christ (Christos - Messiah) contains within itself the teaching about the Holy Trinity).

The thought that the Holy Spirit is the Kingdom of God is found also in Maxom Confessor (v. Florensky p.139: also the Russian theologian, A.S.Homyakov expressed his support of this view - ibid. p.685).

* * * * *

NOTE A.

H. A. Motovilov, disciple of St. Seraphim, has left an account on the teaching of St. Seraphim concerning the Holy Spirit as the end and meaning of Christian life. The account records first, the New Testament teaching that life in Christ means possession of the gift of the Holy Ghost, working within the personality of the believer and transporting it into the likeness of Christ, i.e. making it pneumatophoric. At the question of Motovilov whether any experience of the Holy Spirit as the goal of life in Christ is possible, so that He may be known as the Reality within us, and what is its nature, Father Seraphim answered: "I have already told you, Lover of God, that this is very simple, and in detail I have explained how men are in the Holy Spirit and how we ought to understand his manifestations to us. What more do you need to know, my brother?"

After the expressed desire to know the reality of the Holy Spirit as a human experience, St. Seraphim took Motovilov by the arm and told him that they were both in the Spirit. Motovilov tells how he could not bear to look at the face of the hermit, as his eyes and countenance had become transfigured. The hermit, after calming Motovilov and telling him not to be afraid, said, "This is an act of the Grace of God, which I have prayed God might grant you to see and experience". "After these words", says Motovilov, "I looked at his face and a fear of God fell upon me both tremendum and fascinosum. Imagine in the centre of the sun, in the warmth of its noon brilliance, the face of man speaking with you. You see the movement of his lips, the changing expression of his eyes, and you hear his voice, but not only do you not see his hands, you do not see yourself, nor his form, but only one blinding light, spreading far around, lightening with its brilliance the blanket of snow covering the ground, and snowflakes enveloping the great hermit and myself".

Motovilov is asked what he feels and his answer is: "I feel such calm and peace in my soul which cannot be expressed by any words". When questioned by the hermit as to what else he feels, Motovilov answers: "Extraordinary sweetness, joy and warmth." At the mention of warmth, the hermit draws his attention to the fact that they are exposed to the severe Russian winter (this occurred in winter). The account finishes by the hermit pointing out that/

that the Scriptures contain the exact description of what they themselves have experienced. In other words, in this experience they only share in what essentially belongs to the Church (the Holy Spirit) because they are themselves its members. "Our present experience" says the hermit to Motovilov, "is only what the Apostle says, 'the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit'".

This is translated from the Russian:

Zitie prepodostnago Serafima, ch.x.
Archbishop Veniamin, Paris, 1935.

and also v. N. Ilyin, Seraphim of Sarov, p. 104 ff.
Paris, Y.M.C.A. Press, 1925.

(The MS. of Motovilov was obtained in 1902 from the widow of Motovilov and published in 1903).

* * * * *

2. THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC THEOLOGY.

(The Doctrine of the Juridical Mission
of Christ).

PROLEGOMENA.

It is necessary to speak, at the very outset about the philosophical Weltanschauung underlying the whole structure of Roman Catholicism. Without understanding this, our interpretation of Roman Catholic theology would fail to convey its true character. For scholastic Weltanschauung is a background against which the interpretation of Christian faith is portrayed in Roman Catholicism. Those who come to the study of Roman Catholic theology ignoring this fact, and who try to understand the nature of Christian faith in Roman Catholicism without studying it in its relation to its background of scholastic philosophy, (itself a mixture of Greek philosophy and Roman law), become baffled, for Roman Catholicism does not reveal its secret, the why of its dogma and its ethics. The essential thing to remember, therefore, about the picture of Christian faith as portrayed in Roman Catholicism is that it is stamped with the seal of legalism. Everything is seen in terms of law and order. The Universe is maintained by the order created by the constellation of laws at work in it. This Stoic idea was brought into the Christian Religion and wedded to it by Tertullian, and later became the basis of Latin Christianity. The philosophical Weltanschauung of Roman Catholicism postulates the following conclusions about/

about the existence of any entity of which we are aware (the Church, for instance); it says that it exists in virtue of the immanence in it of the intellect (a sort of consciousness of itself) centred in one of its organs, from whence it permeates and rules the rest. This intellect is implanted by God and thus commands absolute obedience to itself. In order that the intellect may accomplish this, from it proceeds the Will which executes the laws decreed by the intellect within the reality. The Will is subordinate to the intellect, which has primacy over it.

Secondly, Roman Catholic theology, (the creation of mediaeval scholasticism) seeks to understand reality by breaking it into opposites, such as supernatural and natural, (the most favourite category) spiritual and temporal, universal and particular, etc. In its striving to overcome this duality, Roman Catholic theology does not bridge it by making reconciliation between these opposites, whereby they may become interdependent, but rather establishes the principle of the primacy of one of them, and hence of subordination, in which the subordinate side, in this relation of polarities, suffers the arbitrary demand upon it of the other polarity which claims to be the raison d'etre of the whole being consisting of these opposites.

This/

This prolegomena is necessary to this essay, in order to understand the mental atmosphere of Roman Catholic theology. Intelligo ut credam or credo ut intelligam, here mean the same. They both affirm what has been said above, regardless of whether this is reached by the intellect, paving the road for faith; or by faith leading the intellect to comprehend the nature of reality thus construed.

* * * * *

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC
ECCLESIOLOGY.

The student of theology, for whom the meaning of ecclesiology is deeply interwoven with the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is somewhat disappointed to find that the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not indispensable to the Roman Catholic theologian expounding the doctrine concerning the Church. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is exploited to the full by Catholic theologians, not to explain the meaning of ecclesiology but to guarantee the Divine character of the Church, which is established a priori to its consciousness of being the Spirit-bearing organism, consisting of men and women, for whom Jesus of Nazareth is the Lord in whom God reveals Himself, entering into relationship with men, (who accept this revelation) by bestowing upon them the Holy Spirit, who unites them to God and to each other through Himself, in Christ. This New Testament view of the Church, becomes modified by the Roman Catholic theologian; for him the Church is an act of the Juridical Mission of Christ. The meaning of the term 'Juridical Mission of Christ' needs to be explained by giving a short summary of the Christology which underlies Roman Catholic teaching concerning the Church. Jesus the Christ is the Revelation of the Absolute/

Absolute Supernatural Divine Being in human existence, (The Revelation of the Absolute Intellect), The terrestrial - 'natural' existence, unlike the Supernatural, is not its own creation but that of the Supernatural, to which it is completely subordinate. Jesus the Christ is the Divine claim of the Supernatural Divine order of being over the temporal. His claim has the authority of law. In order to establish His claim within the order of the natural realm, Christ creates within it the New Order - the Church, through which the Supernatural order reclaims to itself the obedience of the fallen natural order. But Christ who eminently belongs to the Supernatural Divine order as the Son of God, does not remain within the natural order. He came only to establish the New Order - the Church through which the Supernatural purpose for the world is manifested. The Church for the Roman Catholic theologian is "a kingdom ruled in His (i.e. Christ's)¹ absence by men" (Matt. 18:18; John 21:17). It is therefore a visible theocracy; and it will be substituted for the Jewish theocracy that has rejected Him, (Matt. 21:43). Moreover, it will be a Supernatural Kingdom of truth, in the world though/

1. Enclosure mine.

though not of it (John 18:36)¹. This has come about by Christ's own delegation (so the Roman Catholic theologians interpret it) of His own authority to the Apostles after the Resurrection (Matt. 28:19-20)². In what has been said lies/

1. v. The Catholic Encyclopaedia, Vol.III, p.746 (The Church). This whole scheme of thought may be illustrated from an essay "Faith and Revealed Truth", in the book "The Teaching of the Catholic Church", Vol.I. by Roman Catholic theologian Canon George Smith:
 "The Church..... teaches that there is an order of reality above that of nature, an order of reality which is beyond human mind: the Supernatural order (p.5).....

The Supernatural order, therefore, by its very character is outside the scope of our natural knowledge and comprehension. We can know nothing of it unless God wills to reveal it.... This calls for a special intervention of God (ibid) for the inauguration of a Divine intercourse with man whereby He communicates knowledge otherwise unattainable; in other words, Supernatural revelation. (ibid p.6)

.... At last Christ came and with Him the completion of God's message of mercy.... (ibid. p.9)

.... But from the beginning of His ministry He laid the foundation of His Church, collecting a chosen band of disciples... (ibid p.10).

..... To these, under the primacy of Peter, He gave special powers: a teaching authority such that to hear them was to hear Christ Himself...; powers of jurisdiction over all believers, that they might govern Christ's spiritual kingdom on earth' (ibid).

2. v. The Teaching of the Catholic Church, Vol.II. p.721.

lies the Juridical Mission of Christ.

In the Apostolic College, Christ deposits the Idea of the Church, i.e. the Intellect. And since the Idea, the Intellect, begets according to the scholastic philosophy, the Will, the Apostolic College executes within the Church authority on behalf of the Supernatural authority of Christ, in order to submit to Him in the fulness of time. Roman Catholic theology, with its legalistic mind, seems to have found the idea of the Juridical Mission centred in the Apostolic College exposed to the danger of discord due to its plural nature, unless saved from this danger by establishing the principle of primacy within the Apostolate of the Church, which would have the authority to embrace within itself the whole authority of the Church. For this reason, Roman Catholic theology has construed the idea of papal primacy, based upon the Gospel narrative of Matt. 16:13 ff., where Christ acknowledges Peter's Confession of Faith at Caesarea Philippi. "It is the belief of Catholics," says the Roman Catholic theologian A. Graham, "that Our Lord promised to Peter a primacy of jurisdiction over His Church, a primacy which He actually conferred after His Resurrection (John 21:15 ff): they hold, moreover, that it was given, not to Peter alone, but to the successors in/

in his office, and that it is vested for all time in the Roman Pontiff, who is the visible Head of the Church¹.

In the hierarchy of the Church, the Supernatural order or being expressed in Christ, establishes in the 'natural' order the principles of the Supernatural Idea (Intellect)/

1. *ibid.* p.716. "So the promised primacy was conferred in the words of the risen Christ.... True, He was only withdrawing His visible presence; He would still take care of His own as their chief pastor; hence the commission: 'feed my sheep'. But Peter had become shepherd of the flock of Christ in the same way as he was foundation of His Church. Christ remains in the words of the selfsame Peter 'The prince of pastors' (I Peter V:4), but he now acts as the Lord's representative, his Vicar, and he together with the rest of the Apostles, under his leadership, is a true pastor of souls." *ibid.* p.718.

v. Also the creed of Pope Pius IV (1564) ratified by the Council of Trent.

"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all Churches: and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman pontiff, successor of the prince of the Apostles, St. Peter, and the Vice-regent of Jesus Christ". v. A History of The Council of Trent, by T.A.Buckley, London, 1852 p.520.

"If any one shall say that the Blessed Peter, by the institution of Christ, was not the first among the Apostles, and (Christ's) vicar upon the earth or that it is not necessary that there be in the Church one pontiff, the successor of Peter, and equal with him in the authority of government, and that his successors in the Roman see up to the present time had not the right of primacy in the Church; that there was not a father, pastor, and teacher of all Christian whatsoever, and that the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church, was not delivered to the same by our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Peter, let him be anathema". From the Seventh Canon of the Council of Trent (amended form) T.A.Buckley, *ibid.* p.386.

(Intellect). The hierarchy is conscience, guardian and teacher of the natural order, which owes it obedience. The 'natural order' comprehends this through the teaching of the doctrine of Revelation, which the hierarchy is charged to dispense. Hence the principle of the doctrinal authority of the hierarchy in the Church, and its corollary, the establishment of the Will or the Law implied in the Supernatural Idea, but which the hierarchy now administers, for it proceeds from it insofar as it represents the Supernatural Idea or the Intellect in the world. In the procession of Will or Law from the hierarchy lies the juridical authority of the hierarchy in the Church.¹

-
1. According to "Father Paul", historian of the Council of Trent, at Council of Trent one of the major issues was whether the Episcopal authority which derives from the Apostolate of the twelve, was directly from Christ or St. Peter.

..... secondo l'ordine da Christo instituito, gli Apostoli doveano esser ordinati Vescovi, non da Christo ma da Pietro, riceuendo da lui solo la giurisdittione e cosi molti Dottori Catholici anco tengono che fosse fatto; Laqual opinionione è molto probabile. Gli altri però che dicono, gli Apostoli esser stati ordinati Vescovi da Christo, aggiungono che cio facendo, La Maesta sua preuenne l'ufficio di Pietro...."

vide Historia del Concilio Tridentino di Pietro Soave Polano second edition 1629, p. 626.

The whole discussion is most revealing from the standpoint already mentioned, how the dogma of papal infallibility arose as a necessity for a scholastic mind which could not rest at ease with the idea that the plural nature of the Episcopate could be the principle of unity in the Church. And driven by scholastic philosophy, which usurped completely the understanding of the Church pneumatologically, Roman Catholicism postulated finally the dogma of papal infallibility as the logical conclusion of the intrusion and substitution of philosophy for the Christian theology of Revelation.

B.

The Church, provided with this frame or body as described above, is infused with life or soul as the second act in its creation. This is explained by Roman Catholic theologians as the action of another Mission, called Pneumatic (the Mission of the Holy Spirit). Roman Catholic theologians are anxious at this point to stress that the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit has not been forgotten by them, while explaining the Doctrine of the Church. The teaching of St. Augustine in this connection is extensively quoted: "The Holy Spirit is in the Church, the Body of Christ, what the soul is in our bodies"(St. Augustine, Serm. De Temp. cclxviii. Pl.38, 1232, ct.passim)¹.

1. Quoted from E.C.Q. Vol. VIII - 1948:- By Dom Clement Lialine.

The Holy Spirit, says the author of this article, took care of a 'remnant' of Israel in an outward, transitory, conditional way, depending on the fidelity of the 'remnant', his chief action being through the prophets.

In the 'New Israel', the Holy Spirit finds his continual dwelling and is to be found nowhere else except in the Church, for the world cannot receive Him. Dom C.Lialine proves his argument from early patristic literature. Thus he quotes from Hypolitus's 'Apostolic Tradition', an old doxology: 'Glory be to Thee, O Father, and to the Son with the Holy Ghost in the Holy Church', and also St. Irenaeus: 'Where the Church is, there is the Holy Spirit'. The whole essay 'Holy Ghost and Mystical Body of Christ' is a very interesting study of Roman Catholic teaching concerning the Holy Spirit, in relation to the Church. *ibid.* p. 73 ff.

The Holy Spirit provides the Church with charismatic gifts¹. The Pope in exercising his power as the visible Head of the Church, "enjoys the assistance of the Holy Spirit as a guarantee that his rulership will be "unto edification and not unto destruction"².

But now the question naturally arises of how these two Missions (the Juridical Mission of Christ and the Mission/

1. v. Teaching of the Catholic Church, Vol.II, p.697.

2. *ibid.* p.720

"This charism of the faith granted to the Holy Father for preservation of the divine truth does not consist in a sort of inspiration or new revelation, but in the form of the assistance of the Holy Spirit preventing the Pope from erring in the authentic discernment of the deposit of faith, preserved in Tradition".

G. Dejaifve, S.J. "Sobornost or Papacy" III, E.C.Q. Vol. 10, No. 3, 1953, p.122.

v. Also remarks on Father Paul's report on oration of Diego Laines at The Council of Trent: "And when the Synod saith that it is assembled in the Holy Ghost, it meaneth that the fathers are congregated, according to the Pope's intimation to handle that which, being approved by him, will be decreed by the Holy Ghost. Otherwise how could it be said that a decree was made by the Holy Ghost, and could be made to be of no force by the Pope's authority, or had need of confirmation?"

v. T.A.Buckley: 'A history of the Council of Trent' p.361. The famous report on the Council of Trent of 'Father Paul' is known in Latin under the name "Historiae CONCILII Tridentini" - Petri Suavis Polani, 1658.

vide also the same book in Italian, already quoted, esp. p. 627. "Et quando la Sinodo dice, d'esser congregata in Spirito Santo, altro non vuol dire, senon che il padri siano congregati secondo l'intimazione del pontifice, per tratar quello, che venendo approbato dal pontifice, sara decretato dallo Spirito Santo. Altrimenti, come si potrebbe dire, che un decreto fosse fatto dallo Spirito Santo e potesse, per autorita pontificia esser inualidato o havesse bisogno di maggiorconfermatione".

Mission of the Holy Spirit) are related to each other. Dom Clement Lialine in the above-quoted essay expresses the view of Roman Catholic theology on the subject most revealingly when he says, "Apostolic authority respected the gifts of the Spirit: 'Extinguish not the Spirit; despise not prophecies,' St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians (I Thess. 5:19-20), but at the same time acted as their judge."¹

The same view is also expressed in the Catholic Encyclopaedia (Vol.III p.750). The author, while admitting the evidence of the New Testament, that the Holy Spirit revealed His Presence in the Apostolic Church, through charismata, is anxious to subordinate charismata to 'superior authority', which stands over against the charismatic life of the Church. "A direct Divine rule by 'charismata' could only result in confusion, if uncontrolled by any directive power possessed of superior authority. Such a directive and regulative authority, to which the exercise of spiritual gifts was itself subject, existed in the Apostolate, as the New Testament amply shows, I Cor. 14. In the succeeding age a precisely similar authority is found in the Episcopate. Every principle of historical criticism demands that the source of episcopal power should be sought, not in the 'charismata', but where tradition places it, in the Apostolate itself."

This whole argument is only a half-truth The New Testament/

1. E.C.Q. Vol.VII 1948 p.85

Testament certainly does not know anything about this artificial division on 'Superior Apostolic authority' and 'Lower Charismatic'. The Acts of the Apostles, especially Acts XV, dealing with the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem, shows clearly that the whole attitude of Peter was formed and judged by his obedience to the witness of the Holy Spirit in the Church expressed in 'charismata'.

The Apostolate in the Church possessed such authority as it had, not because it had superior authority over charismata, but because the Apostles were the first to acknowledge and interpret their own gift of charismata Christocentrically, and interpret Christ Pneumatocentrically, (namely, they recognised Christ in the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit in Christ). It was this which made them the pillars of the Church and not the 'Juridical Mission of Christ'¹.

There is something legalistic in the Roman Catholic concept of the hierarchy which makes it ecclesia supra ecclesiae, while the Apostles in the primitive Church, exercised authority from within the Church and not from above. Thus, in spite of its claim of the continuity of the Apostolic Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church, the spiritual atmosphere/

1. St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, 3,4: "You can perceive my insight into the mystery of Christ (because I am an Apostle of Jesus Christ) which was made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to the Holy Apostles.... by the Spirit". This negates the Roman Catholic view that the Apostleship is independent of the Mission of the Holy Spirit.

atmosphere underlying the Apostolic authority in the New Testament and that which underlies the Roman Catholic hierarchy shows a break in continuity.

It is obvious that for Roman Catholic theology the Juridical Mission of Christ is normative for the Pneumatic Mission, which becomes subordinate to the former. Roman Catholic theologians, who perceive that this view cannot be maintained without ultimately impairing the unity of the Divine Hypostases of the Son and the Holy Spirit, based on equality, are most anxious to point out that it is impossible to oppose these two Missions to each other. The Papal Encyclical of Pius the XII: "Mystici Corpus Christi", says, "There can be no real opposition or incompatibility between the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit and the juridical office which pastors and teachers have received from Christ. Like body and soul in us, the two realities are complementary and perfect each other, both having their origin in our one and the same Saviour, who not only said, as He breathed the Divine Spirit upon the Apostles: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost' (John 20-22) but also enjoined aloud, 'As the Father hath sent me, I also send you' (20-21) and again: 'He that heareth you, heareth me'" (Luke 10-16)¹.

The insistence upon the unity of Christology and Pneumatology/

1. Quoted from: Teaching of the Catholic Church, p.702.

Pneumatology, which the New Testament expresses in the Encyclical quoted above is not revealed as the inner truth of the spiritual and theological structure of Roman Catholicism; the appeal to the New Testament made in the Encyclical is to bridge this artificial division between the two Missions, (Juridical and Pneumatic) which are not contained within each other, nor in long way creative, interpretative, interdependent of and mutually normative for each other. The Christology (and the Juridical Mission of Christ based upon it) is purely normative and arbitrary as regards the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

* * * * *

3.

Papal Infallibility as the Solution of the Problem.¹

It is to avoid the clash implied in this dichotomy of Christology and Pneumatology that Roman Catholicism finds in the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility a concept by which this dichotomy is arrested and which saves the Church from the disaster of a theology based on a scholastic logic. It is from this standpoint that we can best appreciate theologically the inner significance and need for the Great Myth of Papal Infallibility, i.e. the primacy of Peter and his papal successors. No theologically minded/

1. Vide. Appendix I at the end of this essay.

minded person can fail to understand why Roman Catholicism clothes this doctrine with mystical significance, and why it becomes central to its whole structure, while considering the necessity which brought it about, namely, the inability of scholastic theology to see Christology and Pneumatology in terms of the New Testament Revelation. In the New Testament they reveal their organic unity based on the paradox of their identity and difference and not in terms of dichotomous philosophical thinking which needs a pair of opposites in order to describe the nature of being. When this philosophical technique is taken inside Christian theology, and Christology and Pneumatology are made two concepts of this kind, it cannot but result in dualism, notwithstanding the solving of the problem by way of the subordination of Pneumatology to Christology which ultimately does not work. To save itself from its logic, scholastic theology sought refuge in the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility¹. This will become clearer as/

-
1. The Roman Catholics are surprised that non-Roman Catholics are offended by this doctrine, because Roman Catholics read the necessity of their logic as being implied in the New Testament Revelation; and this makes the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility most obvious to Roman Catholics, which is not the case with those who do not share the presuppositions of the scholastic philosophy, which underlie the logic of Roman Catholic theology.

clearer as we proceed further to examine the nature of this doctrine.

* * * * *

It is abundantly clear that Roman Catholic theology conceives the Church as the creation of the Juridical Mission of Christ and the Mission of the Holy Spirit in terms of subordinating the latter to the former. This in turn results in the two-fold character of the Church, the hierarchy and the laity. The tension between these two groups in the Church is solved by the principle of the primacy of the Juridical Mission of Christ over the Pneumatic Mission. Thus the laity become subordinate to the hierarchy. This state of affairs is explained as having the sanction of Divine Law against which there can be no appeal. The reason why this enforced dichotomy of the two 'churches' within the Church and this unwarranted subordination of the soul of the Church to the body of the Church, could continue to function (apart from the shock it received at the Reformation) was due to that greatest of all myths, namely, the primacy of St. Peter over the other Apostles, and the continuation of the Petrine/

Petrine primacy in St. Peter's successors - the Bishops of Rome¹. This myth filled the need in Roman Catholic Christianity to bridge the gulf created by the dichotomy between the Juridical Mission of Christ and the Mission of the Holy Spirit. The hierarchy found the idea of the papacy/

-
1. This myth was originally upheld to support the claims of the Bishop of Rome in ecclesiastical rivalries amongst the ancient Sees, in which Christianity first established itself, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Rome. To these there was added in the IVth century, Constantinople, which claimed precedence over Rome because it had the Roman Emperor (now Christian) as its first citizen. It was the ingenuity of the Roman See to support its claim for primacy by the myth of Petrine supremacy over the Apostles and the delegation of this supremacy by Peter to the bishops of Rome. This claim rests on the Roman Catholic assertion that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, though this is based more on legend than on history. It never occurred to the Bishop of Antioch (where Peter, according to the testimony of the Acts of the Apostles, resided), and who more rightly claims to be St. Peter's successor, to utilise the myth of Petrine supremacy and its continuation in the Church through St. Peter's successors.

In his book, 'Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism', p.65, N.Arsenew quotes Origen who writes (Serm VI on the Gospel of St. Luke) "Ignatius, the second Bishop after Peter". In Eusebius we read: "Peter, the leading Apostle having founded first the Church in Antioch, is also the first to preside over the Church in Rome until the end of his life." (Cronicorum libri II, ed. Schone, t II.152). And also Pope Innocent I (401-417) in a letter to Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, calls the Church of Antioch, "prima primi Apostoli sedes" (v. also 'The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part II. C.VII. Q.25. Here the order of primacy of ancient Episcopal Sees is mentioned. Rome, Constantinople, and then "Tertius Antiochenus, ubi Petrus sedem primo locavit." vide. Oscar Cullmann, 'St. Peter, Apostle and Martyr'.

papacy (based on the primacy of St. Peter) acceptable, for in it they saw the sealing of their claim of authority over the Church, (the Bishop of Rome being essentially one among the rest of the successors of the Apostolic College), and the laity found in the papacy someone who stood beyond the superior Apostolic hierarchy, to whom it was possible to appeal as protector of the Church created by the Pneumatic Mission against the Church created by the Juridical Mission of Christ¹. And when in 1870 the Dogma of Papal Infallibility was promulgated and was with small exceptions accepted by hierarchy and laity, one must understand theologically why this doctrine and the myths/

-
1. N.Arsenew, Russian theologian, recalls how a Roman Catholic theologian of his acquaintance used to refer to the Dogma of Papal Infallibility as the Catholic spiritual 'magna charta libertatis' *ibid.* 107. One is reminded here of a dictum: "Divide et Impera" for Roman Catholicism divides the Church in two and maintains its unity by imposing authority over the Church, which because it keeps the peace between two polarities is described as 'magna charta libertatis' in spite of its rigid authoritarianism.

myths underlying it are so necessary to Roman Catholicism to keep its theological structure together, and also why this Dogma has so great mysticism about it¹.

* * * * *

4.

Papacy and Sobornost.

A modern Roman Catholic writer rightly says in his polemic/

-
1. I was aware of this in 1946 when in St. Peter's in Rome; 32 new Cardinals were being promoted and the Pope was carried in to preside over the ceremony. The tremendous ovation which he received from the laity and clergy present made it clear to me that the Pope stood for some great symbol, and this symbol is the reconciliation in him of two 'Churches' created by two Missions, the Juridical Mission of Christ and the Pneumatic Mission. There was, I was aware, a sense of finality, which comes on those occasions when people objectivise transcendence, and mistake this pseudo transcendence for the reality which cannot be 'objectivised', for in that moment it vanishes and man lives with his own image thereof, which is the lure of idolatry.

This mysticism may be illustrated from "Confessio Romano Catholica in Hungaria Evangelicis publice proscripta et proposita". This was a sort of confession to which Protestants received into the Church of Rome had to subscribe. Thus it is stated in articles of this document.

III. Confitemur, et certi sumus, Papam Romanum Vicarum esse Christi, plenariamque habere potestatem omnibus hominibus, pro voluntate sua, peccata remittendi, retinendi, (in) infernum detrudendi, excommunicandique.

IV. Confitemur quicquid Papa instituerit novi, sive intra sive extra scripturam, quicquid etiam demandaverit, esse verum divinum et salvificum; ideoque a Laicis majoris aestimari debere, Dei Vivi praeceptis.

V. Confitemur, Papam Sanctissimum ab omnibus honore divino honorari debere, majori cum genuflexione, ipsi Christo debita".³.

(V. Letters to M. Gondon, etc. by C. Wordsworth, London, 1848. p. 74 ff.)

Vide Also Appendix II at the end of this essay.

polemic on the subject of Papacy and Sobornost, that from the Roman Catholic standpoint the Pope stands as the guardian of Sobornost; without him unity within the Roman Catholic Church is unthinkable. "The Roman Pontiff is bishop of a local diocese like his brothers in the Episcopate, but in addition the Christ has entrusted to him a special office, namely, to guard in his capacity as successor of Peter in the See of Rome, the unity of the Sobornost itself. It is to him that is entrusted the mission of defending the cohesion of the flock of Christ dispersed throughout the world in local communities, of assuring the unity of action of the Episcopate and the purity of orthodoxy and of promoting the common well-being of the whole Church".¹ What the writer forgets, however, is that Sobornost ceases to be Sobornost if its unity needs to be guarded by an external authority. Sobornost and Papal authority stand for two different philosophies and theologies. Sobornost denotes that this temporal and natural order of human existence has, in Christ through the Holy Spirit, been reunited to the supernatural, eternal order. This is continually being realised in the Church in which Christ and the Holy Spirit abide through each other. The Church lives by this truth as the very consciousness of its being. This truth cannot be objectivised in an external/

external organ of authority, for this objectivisation as its 'safeguard' would deny it, by subjecting its spiritual freedom, revealed from within, to authority imposed from without. Papal authority denotes that this temporal, 'natural' order of being, has been invaded and continually subjected and re-conquered by the Supernatural Divine order, through the instrumentality of the Church. Papal authority holds the keys, in the name of the Church, of the power of the Divine Order which is centred in Christ. But Christ is absent from this natural order, having committed the Church to His Vicar, the visible Head of the Church, the Pope who rules it in His stead¹. This view pre-supposes a rigid dichotomy between supernatural and natural, and has been maintained by being built on an exclusive Christology which at best recognises Pneumatology as subordinate to itself, instead of being interpreted by it, and revealing that interdependence between them which gives meaning to both./

1. V. Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part I. C.X., Q.X.

"This Church has also one ruler and one governor, the invisible one, Christ whom the eternal Father hath made head all over the Church, which is His body, but the visible one is he, who, the legitimate successor of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, occupies the See of Rome".

English translation by T.A.Buckley, London, 1852.

both. Christology without Pneumatology or 'exclusive' Christology is false Christology. The Christian theology built upon it demands an ever-increasing system of dogmatic and legal formulations to bridge the contradictions within it. This is the inevitable course of Christianity where the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is misunderstood.

* * * * *

5.

Roman Catholicism: the Expression of Disunity between Christology and Pneumatology.

Roman Catholicism is theologically a very complex structure¹. In this essay, however, it is our purpose to comprehend the meaning of Roman Catholic ecclesiology from the standpoint of the unity and interdependence of Christology and Pneumatology, in which only, as I have anxiously tried to show in the whole of this work, the true meaning of all that belongs to Christianity is to be grasped. And as regards ecclesiology, this is of special importance, for a Christian believer is in the greatest/

1. "We see in Catholicism elements of various kinds, which it seems exclude each other. Mysticism and Legalism, fervour of religious sentiment and rationalism, opposition to the world and striving for power over it, etc. Is it possible to make a unity from all this? A learned German theologian, himself a former Catholic, strives to explain Catholicism as "complexio oppositorum".

N. Arsenew, *ibid.* p.27.

Vide also recent book 'Return to Reality' by W.P.Witcutt. S.P.C.K. London, 1954.

greatest need of understanding the meaning of the Church in which he lives and within which his personality is continually made aware of the claims of Christ upon it. In the chapter on the Eastern Orthodox Church, I have described the Eastern Orthodox concept of the Church as the spiritual entelechy. This term may be aptly used to describe the Roman Catholic ecclesiology. The difference between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism is that the Eastern Orthodox conceives this entelechy mystically; Roman Catholics, juridically. Translated in terms of the Christian Revelation this means that inside this natural, temporal order of being, according to the Eastern Orthodox view, the Christ, 'The Word made Flesh', is present in the Holy Spirit, through whom He gathers unto Himself the Church - the Divine humanity, Himself being its Head and Corner stone. For the Roman Catholics, Christ is not present in this sense in the natural temporal order. What is present, however, is His Church, in which Christ's laws (the expression of the Divine Intellect and the Divine Will) are present; embodied in the visible Head of the Church, Christ's Representative on earth, the Pope (Vicar Christi) in whom abides the 'potestas plena' of supernatural divine authority. The union of Divine-human in Christ (or supernatural-natural) here is conceived as a process accomplished/

accomplished within the Church, under the rule of the Pope. The supernatural order may act upon the Church from without, not to over-ride the laws already divinely established by the Juridical Mission of Christ, but to show that the authority based upon the Juridical Mission of Christ has the sanction of the Divine supernatural order, on behalf of which it operates in history. It is clear that here we have to deal rather with Aristotelian philosophy than Christian theology. It is also clear why Roman Catholicism has substituted the concept of Supernatural Grace for the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, for God can not abide in the temporal, natural order. (the doctrine of the Holy Spirit asserts precisely that God abides in natural order), but can only act from above through Supernatural Grace, the channel of which is the Church, which succours and redeems the natural order of being from its 'naturalness'. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which says explicitly that God in Christ through the Holy Spirit is present in the natural order through the Church, in their very Hypostases, is an embarrassment to Roman Catholicism with its dualism which the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit negates.

* * * * *

b.

What then can be said about Roman Catholic ecclesiology with/

with Papal Infallibility as its very heart, from the standpoint of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit? It can not be described as other than a Pneumatological heresy, for the following reasons. 1) It denies that the existence and mystery of the Church in its wholeness (*totalitas ecclesiae*) is hidden in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as the Body of Christ. It is this fact which must reinterpret and give meaning to the Christological basis of the Church. In Roman Catholicism, Christology and Pneumatology do not belong to the same whole, in the sense that without their interdependence, unity and equality, the understanding of Revelation becomes distorted; and consequently, ecclesiology built upon such an understanding of Revelation is, by the nature of the case, false.

2) Roman Catholic ecclesiology is built on what A.S.Homyakov calls 'lack of faith', or the doubt that the Holy Spirit, acting from the whole Body of Christ, will guide the Church to its destiny, revealing to the Church the Presence in it of its Head, Jesus the Christ, in whose victory over sin and death the Church participates through the Holy Spirit, who/

who abides in the Church¹. Therefore with its legalistic system, Roman Catholicism subjects the Spirit to the Law, and in order to disentangle itself from the shackles of its legalism, canonises it as the Dogma of Papal Infallibility, achieving by this device pseudo-transcendence over its legalism. If Aritotelian Cosmology and Roman Law were taken from modern Roman Catholicism, its imposing structure would reveal how much Roman Catholicism is dependent upon these two, but without which modern Roman Catholicism cannot be understood. Roman Catholicism may use the language of Biblical revelation, but interpretes this revelation in terms of the Greek Philosophy of Aristotle and Plotinus, and/

-
1. "The striving to establish Papal Infallibility in the sphere of faith... comes, as Homyakov rightly remarks from lack of trust. The place of the Invisible Head of the Church is occupied by His Visible 'Delegate' (Vicar of Christ). Instead of the Invisible Spirit of God, living in the body of the Church, it is necessary to have an external oracle of truth in order to be subordinate to it. The growth of infallibility (i.e. the belief in an infallible Pope) means a loss in understanding of the mystical nature of the Church; loss of belief in the Church. For the Church is also an object of faith inasmuch as she is the Body of Christ and the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit: "In One, Holy, Catholic (Soborniy) and Apostolic Church".

N. Arsenew: op. cit. p.102-3

and Roman Law¹. By its long usage of these two it has consecrated them, and any attack upon the structure of Roman Catholicism derived from them is considered as a threat to its very life. This explains partly why Roman Catholicism refuses rapprochement with Christian communities outside its own fold, except on Roman Catholic terms, a refusal which reveals, perhaps, a subconscious fear of examination in the light of a true theology of Revelation. The historic experience of various Uniate Churches shows that Roman Catholicism is prepared to overlook the doctrinal heresy of other Christian bodies, provided the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility is unconditionally accepted. But this/

-
1. Nicolas Berdyaev whose writings reveal profound understanding both of Greek philosophy and Christian theology, continually points out that Roman Catholic theology can not be understood without the knowledge of Aristotilian philosophy. He ascribes 'objectivisation' of the Church in Roman Catholicism to the Aristotilian categories which determine Roman Catholic theology. Thus he says in his book "Freedom and Spirit": "The Church is above all something invisible, inward, and mystical. It belongs to the spiritual and not to the natural order. So far as this quality is concerned the Church is still only incompletely actualised. In the philosophy of Aristotle and St. Tomas Aquinas potentiality, considered in relation to action, is always identified with imperfection, with matter, and with incomplete being; true being is perfect and is that which is wholly action.... Hence Thomist and Catholic thought has been forced to recognise the historic actualisation and incarnation of the Church as though it were its true being. The mystical Church seems to be non-existent, for being merely potential it is one with imperfection, matter and incomplete being. Aristotle has a tendency towards making absolute historic incarnations and substituting the infinite to the finite". p.332.

this is precisely acceptance of the non-Christian elements in Roman Catholicism as the norm of Christian unity:- Greek philosophy and Roman law, upon which the structure of Papal Infallibility is built.

* * * * *

6.

The Nature of Roman Catholic Spirituality.

Where Christology is divorced from Pneumatology, and where theology is built exclusively upon the former, it is necessary to interpret and relate Christology to a substitute for Pneumatology. This is exactly the meaning of Greek philosophy and Roman law in Roman Catholic theology. For 'pure' Christology is a fiction; there is no such Christology in Christian revelation. There is Christology, the meaning of which is disclosed within Pneumatology and Pneumatology whose meaning lies in Christology. By the nature of Christian revelation, Christology is not sufficient to itself, it demands to be interpreted by and completed with Pneumatology. Where Pneumatology is subservient to Christology, as is the case with Roman Catholicism, the place of Pneumatology is taken in reality by Greek and Roman law. Because of this I doubt whether the theology of the Holy Spirit has great possibilities within Roman Catholicism. This last statement might sound very harsh and arguments to the contrary may be/

be brought against it, such as the undeniable sanctity of Saints like St. Francis of Assisi and mystics like St. John of the Cross, etc. Valid as these arguments may be, and I am prepared to admit that in the examples above we witness the revelation of the theonomy of personality within Roman Catholicism, which expresses the unity of Christology and Pneumatology; when one reflects on the spirit of official ecclesiology in the Roman Catholic Church, based on scholastic theology, then one is aware that the existence of St. Francis of Assisi and St. John of the Cross is not due to the spirit of official Catholicism, but in spite of it, a kind of 'donum super additum'¹. Sainthood is Christian charisma which may occur wherever in the New Age of Christ individual man accepts the Lordship of Christ and receives the Holy Spirit and dedicates to God in return for His Gift, one's own personality, by loving and worshipping God, as the source of man's very being, and expressing this God-ward love and worship man-wardly (including and not excluding man). The implication of this is that sainthood in Christ is related/

1. The term 'donum super additum' is borrowed from scholastic theology to explain the mystical nature of sainthood, though the term itself is in truth pneumatological heresy, for charisma such as sainthood is never 'donum super additum', as the Holy Spirit is not 'donum super additum' to Christ, but immanent to His Being, as the Christ is immanent to the Being of the Holy Spirit.

related to and springs from the Christian community. And in this, Roman Catholicism has by no means the monopoly. But the manifestation of sainthood is not sufficient argument that a Church is free from misconception.

The pseudo-Pneumatological conception of Christianity makes the spirituality and piety of Roman Catholicism very naturalistic, sentimental and psychological; this is revealed in the cult of the Virgin and the cults of Jesus (such as the Sacred Heart). The transcendentalism of Roman Catholic spirituality is artificial. Its spirituality is characterised by sentimentalism which is based on pseudo-Pneumatology which substitutes psyche for pneuma, resulting in a need for external authority upon which to rest. This is the prime consequence of the lack of balance and harmony between Logos and Pneuma, the Christ and the Holy Spirit, and results in intolerance and fanaticism¹.

-
1. Roman Catholic spirituality shows a lack of true theonomy, for the Christological element is artificially divorced from the Pneumatological. This divorce gives to the Christological element thus severed from the Pneumatological, a one-sidedness which results in the demand for submission, and reveals itself as transcendent, abstract, inexorable and purely andiric. This element is represented in the hierarchy. The Pneumatological element, divorced from the Christological, appears as psyche, servile, immanent, purely female. This is represented in the Laity and lower clergy. This disunity is most unfavourable for the revelation of theonomy within spirituality. For true theonomy within spirituality is only possible where the unity of Logos and Pneuma is maintained 'without separation and without merging'. This syzygy of Logos and Pneuma is neither exhausted nor represented by any particular entity /

Notes: Contd.

entity, but manifested in it, making its nature theonomous. Christian spirituality being theonomous, is therefore androgenous also. Such spirituality does not know the anathema of the other, it does not feel itself endangered by the world and therefore is not anxious to demand the submission of the world to itself. It reveals to the world, however, the theonomy of being, in which the freedom of being finds its fulfilment.

7.

The Problem of the Christian Doctrine of God in Roman Catholicism.

There have been many attempts in Christian theology outside Roman Catholicism, especially amongst Eastern Orthodox theologians, to review the common dogmas of historic Christianity, which Roman Catholics claim as part of their inheritance, and see why it is that, from the standpoint of dogma, Roman Catholicism branches off from the common Christian tradition and takes an independent line of dogmatic and ecclesiastical development.

The conclusions reached are very often simplifications of various kinds. It seems to me very clear that the real problem lies in the sphere of Pneumatology. The old controversy on filioque, may be dismissed as abstract and too metaphysical, but if we are to account for the minimalism of Pneumatology and maximalism of Christology in Roman Catholic theology, then we see how the doctrine of filioque implicitly endangers this situation, for it breaks the Divine Triad into Diad. It postulates on one side the Father and the Son as one principle, from which the second principle, the Holy Spirit, proceeds. And while the Holy Spirit appears to assume the whole Godhead into Himself, this in fact is not the case. For in order to reveal His true Divine nature, the Holy Spirit does not only proceed from the Father and the Son but also must fall back upon the principle from which He proceeds, and/

and unite in His own Hypostasis this movement of procession and return. This is the dialectic within each Divine Hypostasis. The Roman Catholic doctrine of Filioque which turns the Diad of Father and Son into a Monad, does not allow for the re-establishment of the unity of procession and return in the Hypostasis of the Holy Spirit. The return, to all intents and purposes, swallows the procession and makes the Second Principle, the Holy Spirit, 'proceeding from the Father and the Son' at most, subservient to the First Principle: the Father and the Son whom Roman Catholic theologians describe as 'unum principium'.¹

When Roman Catholic theology brings the Christian Doctrine of God into the sphere of Christian Revelation, the First Principle, the Father and the Son, becomes expressed in the Son, and consequently the Holy Spirit is implicitly subordinate to the Son. He, the Holy Spirit, is not to interpret Christ and be interpreted by Him, as the unity of Divine Revelation, resting upon, and within, both equally; the Holy Spirit is to maintain what Christ established, the Church, identifying Himself with it and defending/

1. It is impossible not to distort dialectic within hypostatic life, where the relationships in the Godhead have a diadic and not triadic nature, for only in and through the third hypostasis, which always demands a triadic and not a diadic relationship to God; the subsistence of each hypostasis is revealed within the divine unity as equality. The diadic relationship, however, could only be maintained by subordination.

defending its laws declared by Christ. Thus, Roman Catholicism commits a great heresy, for its logic implicitly subjects the Holy Spirit to the hierarchy of the Church, established by the Juridical Mission of Christ. In this lies the explanation of what has been said earlier in this work, that for Roman Catholicism the Doctrine of Filioque has ecclesiological and not doctrinal importance as in Protestantism. This distortion of the Doctrine of God and the consequent unbalance in theological thought, is covered up by the introduction of 'pseudo pneumatologies' of various kinds, such as the concept of Papal Infallibility, the concepts of Grace, and of the Merit of Christ and of the Saints. It is precisely because of the absence of true Pneumatology in Roman Catholicism that non-Roman Catholic theologians are able to point out that "a cleavage is made between God and the World" in Roman Catholicism: "Christ becomes transcendent to the world and the Bishop of Rome takes his place in the earthly Church: the Holy Spirit, in fact, loses His hypostatic equality with the Father and the Son, becoming simply a 'power' of Christ, entrusted to the disposal and judgment of the Bishop of Rome.¹

Roman Catholicism implicitly becomes faith based on a Doctrine of God which may be best described as the Unitarianism/

1. Messenger de l'Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe occidentale No. 5 p.46 (quoted by G.Dejaifve, S.J. Sobornost and Papacy III, E.C.Q., No.3 Vol.10, 1955)

Unitarianism of the Second Person. In the Christian Revelation, God manifests His Being, 1) as Complete Transcendence - God the Father. 2) As the Union of God and man, whereby God unites in Himself Divinity and Humanity, intercedes for mankind before Himself and reveals and interprets God to man as the Redeemer - God the Son. 3) As the Abiding of God in the world, through the Church, creating in Himself and through Himself, the Fellowship of men and women to whom Christ as Lord is revealed, making them the Temple or the Body of His Abiding; revealing His own Presence in the world as the Divine Immanence in it - God the Holy Spirit.

In Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, the Second Person virtually usurps the Divine Transcendence of the Father and thus ceases to unite within Himself Divinity and Humanity, revealing His own Person as Mediator between God and man. And though theoretically these functions belong to Christ, Roman Catholicism in practice is driven to make the Virgin Mary the Medium of Divine-Human Union and the Mediator and Intercessor for man before God. The Third Person, the Holy Spirit, by subordination to the Second Person, has been absorbed back into Him; and though Roman Catholic theology speaks of the Holy Spirit as abiding in the Church, He virtually disappears. In order to remedy the havoc of its logic, which empties the Church of the Immanence of the Holy Spirit by subordinating Him to the Son, Roman Catholicism is compelled to confer upon the Pope the/

the objectivity of the function which belongs to the Holy Spirit.

Roman Catholicism, by its rigid division of supernatural and natural, speculative and practical, carries this division into the sphere of the Doctrine of God. It speaks of God theoretically as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; but being committed to the philosophy not of the correlation and the unity of polarities within reality, but of subordination, introduces this subordinationism in God through the Doctrine of Filioque. Thus, in practice, the Trinity is constituted of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Pope.¹ The fruit of the logic of scholastic theology, upon which subordination is based, first within God, and all through reality, makes Christian Doctrine of God a reductio ad absurdum.

Conclusion:

The theological and ecclesiological conflict amongst various Christian groups is due to their divergent views of the Doctrine of God, especially in the sphere of Pneumatology. No other doctrine has been more misunderstood and misinterpreted than the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It may be proved that the failure of modern Christianity (both in mutual relationships amongst Christians of different denominations and in their attitude to the World) are/

-
1. It is only in the light of what has been said here that one is able to understand the necessity for such dogmas as the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, Papal Infallibility and the dogmas of the Bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

are due to its lapses into Pneumatological heresy. This heresy is present in various degrees in all Christian communities. In the foregoing essay I have tried to show that modern Roman Catholicism is by no means free from this heresy. Theological discussion with Roman Catholics on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit carries with it a plea for the re-establishment in their theology of true Pneumatology. For only from this standpoint can the Christian Doctrine of the Triune God reveal its depths and meaning; inspiring seekers of truth to recognise in Christ the Revealer of the Triune God; for the Father and the Holy Spirit abide, through each other, in Christ and Christ in them, in the unity of the Divine Personality of the Living God. In this lies the whole meaning and purpose of New Testament Revelation.

* * * * *

APPENDIX. I.

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is justified by its supporters on the ground that it safeguards and expresses the principles of the unity and authority of the Church, which, it is pointed out, is surely the essential truth about the Church which must be stated definitively. This argument is also favourably regarded by Anglo-Catholics, who seek to justify by it their leaning towards Rome. The 'evidence' which is brought in to strengthen the force of this argument, is the sectarianism to be found in Protestantism. What the protagonists of these views forget, however, is the question: Does the acceptance of Papal Infallibility provide the solution to the problem of the unity and authority of the Church? If by the Church we mean, as we surely must, the Divine-Human society, through the members of which the Holy Spirit reconciles the Kingdom of God and history (i.e. the revelation of Christ as the Lord), and if in this lie the unity and authority of the Church, then the principle of the unity and authority of the Church cannot be 'localised' in and delegated to the Pope, even by Christ, in the legalistic sense in which Roman Catholicism formulates the 'primacy' of Peter. The unity and authority of the Church are a spiritual reality which contains depth and transcendence of truth, which can never be 'objectivised' in the sense in which this objectivisation occurs in the dogma of Papal Infallibility. It is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which condemns the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. This doctrine could have been formulated only in the absence of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Anglo-Catholicism, in search of the 'objective principle' of unity and authority in the Church, should not be dismayed by its present position, which, to use Kirkegaardian terminology, may be described as 'existential dread'. (This phrase is not inappropriate here, because the Christian experiences the problem of the Church very intimately). It should make its decision theologically only on the basis of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. On this basis, it seems to me, there is a possibility of Anglo-Catholic reconciliation to the Eastern Orthodox and rediscovery of the unity and authority of the Church hidden in the mystery of Sobornost. The difference between Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics, theologically speaking, lies in the fact that in Roman Catholicism ecclesiology dominates pneumatology, while the Eastern Orthodox see them as interwoven in each other's structure. This explains why Eastern Orthodox are difficult to 'pin down' when they are asked about their 'objective' principle of authority and unity in the Church. In this difference of interpreting/

interpreting the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are engendered other theological and philosophical differences between Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics, such as the meaning of revelation and history, and their relation to each other. In Protestantism, unfortunately, the existential understanding of the Church through the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not formulated because of the doctrine of Predestination. In consequence, the problem of the understanding of the Church in Protestant theology is vitiated. This may be seen from Emil Brunner's book, "The Misunderstanding of the Church". Brunner's ecclesiology almost degenerates into 'Pentecostalism'. He has little to say as regards the significance of history in relation to the Church. His understanding of the Church as a 'charismatic organisation', gives the impression that history and the Church could almost ignore each other. In the above mentioned book Brunner calls the Holy Spirit 'paralogical' (v. p.48) which suggests that the Holy Spirit is not actively related to history, redeeming it, giving it meaning, and gathering it into Christ by revealing Christ in it, but is rather awaiting the 'eschaton' to negate it. This is an extreme which could only be understood as the opposition to Roman Catholic exaltation of the 'immanent-historic principle' as a dominant factor in the formulation of ecclesiology. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit reveals the unity and mutuality of the 'charismatic' and 'historic' principles. In Eastern Orthodoxy both principles ('charismatic' - Protestant, and 'historic' - Roman Catholic) are bound in an indestructible unity. This makes Eastern Orthodoxy different from both, and explains the contradictory reactions of Protestants and Roman Catholics towards Eastern Orthodox ecclesiology, which to the Roman Catholic appears abstract or not sufficiently concrete, while to Protestants it appears very traditionalist and conservative.

* * * * *

APPENDIX II.

The Papal Infallibility and its Mysticism in Roman Catholicism.¹

It is clear to any student of Roman Catholicism that behind the doctrine of Papal Infallibility there lies a mysticism which is embedded in Roman Catholic piety. And it is this element which gives to this dogma such power in Roman Catholicism. In his book 'Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism', p.46 ff, N.Arsenew, a Russian theologian, surveys modern Catholic teaching about the Church, where this mysticism is explicit. Thus he says: "According to the Vatican Dogma, the knowledge of truth is given to the Pope independently of his connection with the Church - ex sese et non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae." Here, Roman Catholicism has falsified, Arsenew alleges, the teaching about the Church as the Spirit-bearing Body of Christ under only one invisible Head - Jesus the Christ, by transferring upon the Pope alone what belongs to the whole Church. For Roman Catholicism the Holy Spirit living in the whole Church ceases to be the criterion of the Truth. This rather is to be found in a voice of a bishop of Rome; knowing the truth is made an external act for the believers, who are in duty bound to accept that which the Pope declares. Here the Pope takes upon himself what in fact belongs to the Church or rather to Christ; hence there is the mysticism which accompanies this doctrine in Roman Catholicism. Arsenew brings the following quotation from Roman Catholic theologians: Thus, Mgr. Prunel, a French Roman Catholic theologian, writes concerning the Pope in his "Cours Supérieur de Religion": "Le Pope d'être unique à qui l'on attribue des honneurs presque divins..... l'éclat de sa majesté surhumaine."

A German Catholic theologian, E.Przywara, S.J. in his article "Papst-König" writes amongst others, "Divine Majesty makes concrete and visible its holiness in a decisive manner in the Pope, as bearer of the Juridical primacy, i.e. as the corner-stone of what was given to the Apostles...."sein Primat... ist das von demn schliesslich, wenn auch nicht aussliesslich, alles abhängt; Wahrheit des Dogma wie Gültigkeit des Sacramentes."

The tendency to substitute Pope for Christ is found in a book 'L'Eglise' by French Roman Catholic Bishop Bougaud. In this book, the Pope is compared with the sacrament of the Eucharist. As in the sacrament of the Eucharist, under the cover of bread and wine, Christ is really present, so is he in reality present in the Pope.

-
1. v.Nickolas Arsenew: Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Protestantism. Paris Y.M.C.A.Press, 1930 (In Russian).
 - v. also N.Arsenew: Orthodox Christianity and Western Christianity (first part of Orthodoxy and Catholicism). Warsaw, 1929. (In Russian).

But Christ is in the Eucharist only half present. "C'est donc toute une moitié de vous même qui me manque, O Mon Sauveur! et que je cherche en vain dans ce tabernacle muet où vous ne parlez pas. Et quelle moitié de vous-même! J'allais presque dire la plus nécessaire. Cette parole infailible qui seule peut empêcher les âmes et les peuples de flotter à tout vent de doctrine." For the other "half" of Christ abiding in the Church, one ought to seek in the Vatican, in the Pope. "Elle est ailleurs en effet; elle est au Vatican; elle est dans le Pape. Le Pape est le second mode de la présence réelle de Jesus - Christ dans l'Eglise." Thus Christ has made two means of his real presence. They are both different, both inexplicable, and which when united together make up the fullness of his Incarnation. "Il s'est fait deux modes de présence réelle absolument différent, - car les grands ne se répètent jamais, ineffables tous deux, et qui réunis forment l'extension totale de l'Incarnation.... O mystère des deux voiles sous lesquels se cache Jesus Christ complete..... Allez au Jesus Christ qui parle: allez au Pape." The Pope, "that is, Jesus the Christ, hidden under the cover, and continuing under the medium of human organ, his public ministry among men." (Quoted by N.Arsenew p.59)

In the foregoing essay on the Roman Catholic Pneumatology, I have pointed out that the way in which Roman Catholicism has mistreated the doctrine of the Holy Spirit compels Catholic theology to rely upon the pseudo-pneumatology. Thus, for instance, the unity of Christ and the Holy Spirit as the essence of Christian Revelation and the Church is turned to be the unity of the Pope and Christ. "No expression shows itself too strong for the Church in order to express that mutual link which exists between Jesus Christ and the Pope its Head, in the same time visible and invisible and its only Bridegroom. She (the Church) shows in relation to him (the Pope) all love, which she cherishes towards the Lord... She wants us to go on our knees before him, that we may kiss his feet, and show him reverence, which would be exaggerated if it weren't directed towards Christ, who is linked with the person of the Pope in an invisible and closest manner." (Bougaud, quoted by N. Arsenew, p.59 ff).

That the idea of Papism in Roman Catholicism stands as a substitute for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit may be best illustrated from the following quotation from Bishop Bougaud. "Jesus Christ 'has gathered and condensed the whole Church in the Pope' (ibid p.60) More than that, Christ has created the Pope before the Church. (This is reminiscent of the Doctrine of Filioque, where the Father and/

and the Son make the Holy Spirit to proceed from Them. Comment mine). "Il a d'abord fait le Pape. Il l'a fait avant l'Eglise."

According to the Christian Ecclesiology, the Church is the constant creation of the Holy Spirit, gathering all things in Christ; but for Bishop Bougaud, the Church is the constant creation of the Pope. "Voila le mystere. L'Eglise est l'incessante et permanente creation du Pape." (ibid). Bougaud continues, "As the Lord did not at once create us but creates us continually..... so the Pope continually creates the Church. There is not in the Church one gleam of light, one drop of life, nor one atom of authority, which in every moment does not come upon her (the Church) through the Pope.... and so all comes from the Pope. He creates the Church; and in her and through her he illumines and sanctifies souls." (quoted by N. Arsenew, ibid. p.60). N. Arsenew gives further examples from other Roman Catholic sources where this mysticism in regard to the Pope is illustrated, which are of the same kind as those already quoted.

This summary of Arsenew's studies has been made to illustrate my contention that the source of this mysticism surrounding the idea of the Papal Infallibility lies in a distortion of Pneumatology in Roman Catholicism.

* * * * *

3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
IN REFORMED THEOLOGY.

(Scripture as the sole norm of the Church, its faith
and life).

PROLEGOMENA.

A. Prior to the exposition of our subject under discussion in this chapter, and for its proper evaluation and understanding, there must be mentioned a peculiar characteristic in connection with the study of Protestant theology; namely, every student thereof must be clear in principle about the meaning of Reformation from the standpoint of his enquiry. To achieve this, he must firstly know about the foundation of the particular doctrine he is examining in New Testament teaching. Secondly, he must have a knowledge of the development of this doctrine within Christian theology prior to the Reformation. Thirdly, he must have an understanding of the attitude towards this doctrine by the Reformers themselves.

When he has grasped the meaning of Reformation thus construed, he must keep this as the reference point of his study proper, which is the re-interpretation of the doctrine he is dealing with in Protestant theology itself. It has been necessary to make this clear, for I believe much mis-understanding on the part of non-Protestant theologians occurs precisely because of their not being able to appreciate this complex structure in studying Protestant theology, for without such an appreciation Protestant theology/

theology often remains an enigma to itself and much more so to non-Protestant theologians. (This generalisation has not been arbitrarily postulated, but inferred from the fact, that without this procedure, it would have been impossible for me to develop the present enquiry). I also believe that this procedure is indispensable to the study of other central doctrines of Christian faith in Protestant theology.

B. The essential unity of all Protestant theology.

In one sense, it is arbitrary to treat any branch of Protestant theology by itself, without considering it in the context of Protestantism as a whole. This I felt especially in regard to the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, for the whole Protestant movement at the Reformation had very great Pneumatological significance, and without realising this, the nature of Reformation is not fully grasped. Protestantism at the Reformation was a movement to restore to the Church the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit at a time when it was in danger of complete eclipse in the West. Theologically, in this more than any other factor, lies the justification for the Reformation. This statement may surprise both Roman Catholics and Protestants, as no dispute at the Reformation was directly characterised by any pneumatological controversy. And yet the problem arising from the distortion of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit/

Spirit before the Reformation, brought about the Reformation. This may be stated briefly as follows: The chief contention of the Reformers was to assert the presence of Christ in the Church (*die Gegenwart Christi*) in an absolute and direct sense; having no 'vicars' acting on his behalf, implying His absence from the Church; but rather the Apostolic ministry of the Word which proclaims and witnesses His presence¹. In this contention, the student of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit realises that the Christological issue was much at stake in the pre-Reformation Church, because of the loss of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But, though driven by pneumatological motives, the Reformers being imbued by Scholasticism, failed to grasp Christian Revelation pneumatologically, in spite of their Biblical scholarship. For they asserted that the Invisible Christ is present in the Church not in the only true media of His presence, the Holy Spirit who/

-
1. "It was the fervent desire of our fathers that the Church's voice should sound forth purely and brightly again. For, in a Church which had subordinated its message to philosophy and adapted it to this world, they had suddenly heard a voice from another world. When they opened the Bible, it was "as if they heard there the living voice of God Himself" (Calvin, Inst. 1, 71). Christ the Saviour-King confronted them there, through the witness of prophets and apostles, in a strikingly personal way".

"The Reformed Witness and the Word of God" by Wilhelm Niesel,
 "The Presbyterian World" - Sept/Dec. 1954, Vol.22, nos.7-8

who reveals Christ in everything that witnesses to Him - Christian fellowship, the Scriptures, Christian faith and devotion, etc; but rather they insisted that Christ is present in the Church, in His Word found in the Bible. This was both Christologically and Pneumatologically gain and loss; gain because the Christ whom scholastic theology has banished from the realm of the 'natural' and confined to the realm of the transcendent and 'supernatural', has become again immanent in the realm of the 'natural' through His Word. The reinstatement of Christology in these terms, had direct pneumatological significance, for the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit was implicitly reinstated. The latter gave the power to Protestant doctrines and the whole movement. Without this, one cannot understand the nature of the Word of God in Protestantism, with its mystic power.¹ The loss was equally great, for one medium, Holy Scripture, through which the Holy Spirit reveals the presence of Christ in the Church, was stressed to the exclusion of others, especially Christian Fellowship - the Church as a living organism, the Body of Christ, in which the Holy Spirit reveals the Lordship of Christ. Secondly, the Doctrine of Christ as/

1. v. Friedrich Gogarten - "Demythologizing & History", ch.2, p. 12 ff. S.C.M. Press, London, 1955.

as the Utterance of God, the Word of God, and the designation of the Christian Kerygma (which is certainly pneumatological in its content inasmuch as it is Christological), as the Word of God obscured the pneumatological character of the Biblical message and made it purely Christological. This happened more in Lutheranism than in Calvinism, where the Christological and pneumatological nature of Christian revelation was better understood. In Lutheranism, to all intents and purposes, Christology swallows up Pneumatology. There, Christian revelation is interpreted in terms of the ontology of Christian faith; namely, that in Christ the victory of being over the non-being of sin and death has been won, and the recognition and acceptance of this fact by faith (*sola fide*) is all which characterises life in Christ. This is only half-truth, so far as Christian revelation is concerned, for together with this 'ontology' of Christian faith, or Christocentrism, there is another and no less integral part, namely the work of the Holy Spirit, whereby individual human lives are made here and now by the Holy Spirit to participate in the victory of Christ in which act Christ becomes an existential reality for a believer. The Holy Spirit is the existential reality of Christian faith. This is of vital importance, for it makes the believer reveal/

reveal through himself here and now, the ontological reality of Christ's victory, not only by falling back by faith on its reality for his salvation, though this is necessary (for reflection is a primary element in faith), but also by uniting with others grasped by faith like him, in worship, in order to witness that Christ is in the midst of the world claiming it for Himself by the power of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit creates and reveals the Church as the bearer of Divine revelation in the world. Thus the two elements of Christian revelation, the Christological and Pneumatological, reveal themselves within the structure of Christian faith, grasping the believer as the one reality of God which encounters man. In this encounter, God in Grace and man in obedience surrender themselves to each other. This act makes man capable of conquering the fate in his existence, and of becoming aware of his destiny.

As there is no division of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Christian revelation, without destroying the nature and meaning of revelation, so there is for Christian theology no division of the 'ontology of Christian faith' (or its Christocentricity) from the 'existential reality' of Christian faith (or its Pneumatocentricity). Luther did not understand the latter part of this correlation rightly, hence the dichotomy in Lutheranism between faith and/

and the empirical life, the Kingdom of God and Kingdom of Caesar, resulting in quietism. The reason for Luther's interpretation of the dual nature of being; Christ and non-Christ, was due to the fact that he related the Holy Spirit exclusively to human individuality, where the Word of God accepted in faith meets man also. Thus the whole relationship between God and the world was interpreted exclusively in terms of the "I-Thou" relationship between God and man¹. This I and Thou, though in it the subjective and ontological side of Christian faith is revealed, lacks the objective and the existential side of Christian faith, lacks the revealing I and Thou of God and man in 'we', of gathering in itself and being gathered into the community of all those who partake of Christ through the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit eminently abides in this 'we', and Luther's confining Him to the individual, has overshadowed Pneumatology by Christology. Thus the reality of the abiding of the Holy Spirit in the world and His claim upon it on Christ's behalf, is taken away, inasmuch as an individual (in the spiritual sense), without being grounded in the fellowship of 'we' in Christ, becomes cut off from it and suffers spiritual loneliness, is not reality but fiction. Such an individual also is not grounded in the world in the spiritual sense. Only an/

1. Kierkegaard remains essentially spiritually Lutheran in spite of his protest against the Lutheran Church in Denmark.

an individual who is grounded in the 'we' of Christian fellowship, is grounded in the world and can assert the reality of the abiding of the Holy Spirit in the world as the reality in whom the existential being is reconciled to its ontological nature in which the victory of Christ is manifested over non-being. Non-being belongs only to the existential side of being and there continually is overcome by the Holy Spirit, who unites the ontological and existential sides of being to each other in Himself, for all those who in the fullness of their human freedom share in Christian revelation. The Holy Spirit reconciles human freedom to the Divine freedom which is the Holy Spirit in whom the Divine truth, the Christ, the Word of God, is revealed.¹

The dualism of being within Lutheranism ought to be understood in terms of the preceding discussion which cannot be carried further here, as this essay is primarily concerned with Reformed theology, for the purpose of which it/

-
1. What has been said above, does not mean that the Church is being exalted at the expense of the individual, but that unless the Christian believer and the Christian fellowship are interdependent upon each other, they are both fictions from the standpoint of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the union of the individual and the Christian community, and vice versa. Where this unity is broken, the Holy Spirit loses reality for both. Any claim of the Holy Spirit, by the Church which enslaves the individual, and the individual who does not affirm the Church spiritually, is false Pneumatology and has nothing to do with Christian revelation.

it has been necessary to preface it with a brief mention of other aspects of Protestant theology which are not without relevance to the understanding of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Reformed theology.

2.

THE PNEUMATOLOGY OF CALVIN
(The Bible as the Word of God).

A.

When a modern theologian takes upon himself the task of understanding Calvin, he realises that theological opinion concerning him is sharply divided. The enmity shown towards him by some is very great, but matched by equal admiration by others, for whom his theology is normative, to be interpreted but never set aside and not taken into consideration. Calvin as a theologian does not deserve either of these extreme attitudes. Neither his enemies nor followers can attack him or praise him as they do for merely theological reasons. The theological condemnation or veneration of Calvin is only the rationalizing of another motive; that which concerns Calvin as the reformer. Here theology and Church history become so interwoven, that the appreciation or criticism of Calvin becomes a hopeless task. Theological enquiry at present, however, is continually being liberated from its domination by/

by Church history, and is increasingly learning to use the latter as a means of understanding itself without being prejudiced by it. It is Calvin THE THEOLOGIAN that we seek to understand here, under the aspect of his teaching indicated by the title of this section.

I mentioned in the prolegomena of this chapter that the Pneumatological element was decisive at the Reformation. This statement may be illustrated from Calvin. One is aware that behind the whole of his theology lies the experience of confrontation with the Lordship of Christ in individual human existence. Calvin saw this also as a truth of human existence in general. For him the Bible historicizes this experience and thus gives it objectivity, and is also its authentication in human subjectivity. Calvin saw, in the Bible, revealed the theonomy of truth, capable of giving meaning to human existence in all its aspects, and liberating it from the threat of non-being which is the dependence of truth upon any external human agency. The external human agency is relative and therefore when it claims to itself the ultimacy which belongs to the truth to which it witnesses it enslaves man, for it usurps the Lordship of Christ in human existence by its own lordship. Calvin threw all his weight passionately to assert the theonomy of being in human existence, by showing that this theonomy is revealed/

revealed in the Bible which is the Divine truth and therefore capable of standing on its own and authenticating itself by virtue of Him whose Word it is. Further, it must be remembered that Calvin considered that this Divine truth, contained in the Bible, which reveals the Lordship of Christ in human existence, was being falsified by the Church, which made the Bible's authority dependent on the consent of the Church,¹ by the sectarians such as the Anabaptists (who disregarded the Bible, claiming the authority of the Holy Spirit, which supersedes it²), and by the unbelievers who doubted the Divine origin of the Bible, and spoke of it as a mere human opinion. His work is an apologia against these three groups and he is anxious to convict each of them of apostasy from truth, which expresses itself as human depravity before God.

B.

THE NATURE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE.

The Bible for Calvin portrays the character of God as revealed in His works. When the witness of the Bible is understood in this way, that which the Bible describes is accurate, for these works are estimated not by our depraved judgment, but by the standard of eternal truth (Inst. I, 6,iii). For Calvin the Bible shows to man God in/

1. Inst. I, 7, 1 ff. Ibid. I, 8, 1.

2. Inst. I, 1, ix.

in Revelation in that aspect of God which speaks of the "objectivity" of His being. There God's otherness and uniqueness are revealed. He stands over against man in the 'aseity' of His being, as the ground of all existence. In this aspect of the revelation of God, man's utter dependence upon Him is revealed. Man here stands before God as His judge convicted of his depravity as a sinful creature. But this is only one side of the revelation which may be described as God in His Word, and as the Word. Calvin, while insisting upon this 'objective' nature of God in His Word, knows that this Word though independent of man is addressed to him, in order to restore him to God and save him from his estrangement from God. Man, however, is not capable of grasping this 'objectivity' in the Revelation although God here addresses him; he can not see this, because of his estrangement from God which makes him an alien from God's truth.

In order to save man from his depravity, God Himself takes the initiative. He enters human subjectivity as the Holy Spirit (Inst. I, 7, iv v). The Holy Spirit makes man open to the Divine truth revealed objectively in the Word. By the Holy Spirit man not only recognises the Word, but also through the Holy Spirit the Word grasps/

grasps man and draws him to Christ.¹ The Word takes possession of man and in this act he becomes convinced of its truth, its meaning and all-binding character for his destiny. Calvin calls this the 'Inner Testimony of the Holy Spirit', in whom the subjective side of God in revelation is disclosed. Through the testimony of the Holy Spirit, the Scripture reveals its own true nature as the Word of God.² In this lies the authority of the Holy Scripture and man's conviction that God is its author (Inst. I,7,iv)³ Thus understood in the objective and subjective sense of revelation, Scripture is the Word of God and as such the reality prior to and the norm of everything which appertains to the life of the believer./

-
1. Wilhelm Niesel "Dies Theologie Calvins", pps. 21,22. "Der Heilige Geist ist allein der Rechte Ausleger der Schrift. Durch ihn wird das Wort der Schrift "kräftlich in die Herzen eingedrückt", so dass wir es wirklich in uns aufnehmen und verstehen'. Ibid. p.25
 2. 'Then only, therefore, does Scripture suffice to give a saving knowledge of God, when its certainty is founded on the inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit'. Inst. I,8,xiii.
 3. 'Let it therefore be held as fixed that those who are inwardly taught by the Holy Spirit, acquiesce implicitly in Scripture, the Scripture carrying its own evidence along with it.... owes the full conviction with which we ought to receive it to the testimony of the Spirit'. Inst. I,7,iv,v.

believer. The Church itself is the creation of the Scriptures and subject to them. Here Calvin with great force castigates the doctrine that the Church gives authority to the Scriptures. This is for him an insult to the Holy Spirit (Inst. I,7,i.). The Holy Spirit causes¹ the Apostles and Prophets to receive the Word: this act is prior to the Church. "Paul testifies that the Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets (Eph.2:20). If the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets is the foundation of the Church, the former must have had its certainty before the latter began to exist" (Inst.I,7,ii).

Calvin's anxiety is to liberate the authority of Scripture from its dependence upon the Church, for Christological reasons. For the Doctrine of Christ in Roman Catholicism was falsified; namely, since Christ belongs to the realm of the supernatural, in the world His authority is within the Church, with a right to exercise it absolutely. This teaching is based on a wrong conception of the Church because of an inadequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This led the Western pre-Reformation Church not only to identify itself with Christ, but to proclaim the dependence of Christ on the/

the Church in the world in proclaiming His Lordship. Christ is not dependent upon 'the Church' in the world, but upon the Holy Spirit, who creates the Church by His indwelling in it. The Church is the Pneumatic Body living by obedience to Christ through the Holy Spirit. Where only a Christocentric conception of the Church is present, the Church becomes totalitarian, because the "We", instead of fostering the "I and Thou" relationship between God and man, and revealing the interdependence of the "We" and the "I and Thou" relationship, dominates the "I and Thou" and subjects it to itself. In this case, the "We" loses its pneumatological nature, for it cuts itself from its ground which is in the "I and Thou" relationship. Thus the constellation of the Divine Theonomy of Christian faith, which is the unity of the "I and Thou" relationship and the "We" is broken and destroyed.

What Calvin was compelled to do was to free the "I and Thou" relationship from its dominance by the "We" or "The Church". (I put the Church in inverted commas advisedly, because a concept of the Church in which "We" dominates "I and Thou" is a distorted one). In order to achieve this task, Calvin propounded the doctrine of the Scriptures as the guarantee of the objectivity of "I and Thou" relationship in itself; thus liberating the/

the "I and Thou" relationship of God and Man from its dependence on "We" or the "Church". The doctrine of Scripture in the manner in which Calvin developed it is a magna charta libertatis of the "I and Thou" from the "Church". In this doctrine Calvin subjects the "We" to the "I and Thou". "Nothing, therefore," says Calvin, "can be more absurd than the fiction that the power of judging Scripture is in the Church, and that on her nod it certainly depends." (Inst. 1,VII, 2.) And yet Calvin having divested the "We" or the "Church" from its dominance over the "I and Thou" relationship and subjected the "We" to the "I and Thou" does not completely dismiss the relevance of the Church. For he says the Church's witness to the truth may be pertinent to those who are unable to grasp the truth except by leaning upon human testimony. (Inst. 1,VII.3.)

C.

THE NATURE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

(THE UNITY OF THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT)

The Protestant doctrine at the Reformation that the Holy Spirit is revealed in human subjectivity revealing the Word was exploited by the sectarians, mostly by the Anabaptists. They perverted the teaching of the Reformers who had asserted the supremacy of the individual under the Scriptures by asserting the supremacy of the individual under/

under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Their difference from the Reformers lay in their assertion of the Holy Spirit over the Word. This resulted from the inadequate and simplified teaching of the Reformers about the structure of Christian Anthropology. The Reformers for all intents and purposes stressed the intellectual side of man's nature, as normative to man's emotional side, which according to them is subject to the intellectual side. The stress upon Scripture as a source of the knowledge of God, "nolens volens", added to the exaltation of the intellect. The emotional side being thus suppressed sought a means of release. The Sectarians argued that if the Holy Spirit indwells human existence, He, being God, has ultimacy in Himself, and therefore could guide and inspire the individual directly, without having recourse to the Scriptures which would mean subjecting God to the Book¹. This way of interpreting/

-
1. The problem of Pentecostalism in Protestant Christianity is engendered by an inadequate estimate in Protestant Theology of the Psychology of human nature. In "Catholic Christianity" this problem is not acute nor does it present a danger, for its sacramentalism and worship construed around it gives an adequate expression to the emotional life of a believer and makes it the vehicle of the knowledge of God sui generis, rather than something to be suppressed. Protestantism resolves into Pietism and into Quietism (Lutheranism), Puritanism in Calvinism in the past, and modern Evangelicalism at present where the stress on the commitment of the will to Christ is made. This relieves partly the emotional side of human nature. The craving for the Evangelical revival is a search for the Church in which the "I and Thou" would find fulfilment in the "We", and the "We" in the "I and Thou".

interpreting the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, by divorcing it from the Word, was of course a distortion containing great dangers. Calvin accuses Sectarians of libertinism, and in his discussion with them expresses his own views about the nature of the Holy Spirit.¹ "How do the Sectarians understand the Holy Spirit?" he asks. If they say the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ then surely they must admit that the Apostles and other believers in the primitive Church were illumined by the Spirit; if so, then from their testimony we ascertain that they knew only the Holy Spirit, who testified to Christ. This implicitly means that the Spirit upholds the Scripture and is recognised by this test. Here Calvin, who in his discourse about the nature of the Bible shows the insight that the Bible receives its meaning not only by the objective nature of Revelation portrayed therein, but also by its acknowledgment in subjectivity of human existence through the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, goes back on his steps and sacrifices the spirit of the Bible to the letter. It is here that he allows himself to be claimed as the forerunner of modern fundamentalists. Calvin was driven to this position because of his distortion of the true theonomy of the Christian faith which is revealed only in the unity of the "I and Thou" relationship of God and man in its unity with the "We" which stands here/

1. Inst. I, 9.

here to denote the Christian fellowship as the indispensable constituent of the Revelation of the theonomy of being in Christ. As has been already remarked in Calvin, the opposite error to that of the Roman Catholic Church emerged. He subordinated the "We" to the "I and Thou", and thus broke the unity of the theonomy of Christian faith. It is only where this theonomy is fully present in its unity that the Holy Spirit reveals his hypostasis as one who interprets the Bible and reveals the Church, and not conversely. It would not do, however, to assert as Geoffrey Nuttall does, that for Calvin the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is of small account¹. This is not the case. What Calvin actually did was to interpret the theonomy/

1. Vide.

"The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and Experience". Page 6. Calvin himself, for all his insistence on the Spirit's witness, yielding an intuitive certitude of Scripture autopsistos, has been pronounced justly as "Kein Geistesmensch". Nuttall quotation from P. Wernle, that for Calvin the Holy Spirit is a necessity for thought, rather than a reality knowable in experience is a misunderstanding of Calvin to a very great extent. It must be remembered that in his book referred to here, Nuttall deals with Puritanism, which was a product of an uneasy compromise between Calvinism and Anabaptist doctrine. The Puritan faith and experience is not the best standpoint from which to understand the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the theology of Calvin. Modern Anglo-American Protestantism, known better as "Evangelicalism", is the continuation of this uneasy compromise between Calvinism and Anabaptist doctrine. That is why there is so much tension in it, for its Calvinist side seeks subconsciously to establish the primacy of the Word over the Spirit, while the Anabaptist side seeks to establish the primacy of the Spirit. The compromise is reached by revivalism, in which each side feels it has scored a victory over the other. So the alliance continues.

theonomy of being in the Christian Revelation in terms of the "I and Thou" relationship of God and man, and explain the doctrine of the Holy Spirit exclusively in terms of this incomplete theonomy. Calvin knew, of course, that it is impossible to speak about the relationship between God and man (or Christ and man, for Christ rightly asserts that the Christian relationship to God means a relationship to Christ in whom God reveals His manward nature), without explaining that this occurs within the objectivity of the third entity, which is immanent in both of them - that is, the Holy Spirit¹. The Holy Spirit in the sphere of human existence speaks to us from the Bible. Here Calvin recognises the need for the third part of the theonomy which characterises the Christian faith. But the Bible, however, cannot become this third, the "We" of the theonomy, for the simple reason that it is an object, an "It", however holy and exalted it may be. Here it may be asked whether the Church as the "We" is not also an "It", and impersonal. If the Church is understood in terms of the subordination of the "I and Thou" relationship to the "We", then it is an "It", and it is not part of the divine theonomy of being/

1. The Holy Spirit is immanent in Christ by the nature of Christ's divinity, and in man by the love of God which bridges the gulf between God and man.

being in the Christian Revelation¹. But if the Church embodies the "I and Thou" relationship of God and man in itself, i.e. the "We", it is not an "It", but it becomes a personal entity, the third factor of the theonomy² of the Christian faith, in which there is no need for the positing of external authority in the Church as is done by the Roman Catholics and Protestants. Such a necessity arises where the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is absent or distorted.

Calvin for all intents and purposes develops his doctrine of the Holy Spirit with complete abstraction of the "We", from the true theonomy of being in Christian Revelation. He concentrates purely on the subject side of this theonomy, which is in the "I and Thou" relationship of God and man. But since it is impossible to exclude the "We" altogether, for it is impossible to explain the "I and Thou" relationship in any meaningful sense, without the reference to the third element in the theonomy of Christian/

-
1. This point may be best illustrated from the story of Joan of Arc, whose trial for heresy revealed the tragedy and fall of the "We" - the Church, in its attempt to dominate the "I and Thou". This is well portrayed in Jean Anouilh's play 'The Lark', where the story of Joan of Arc is dramatically told.
 2. If the Church does not do this, it becomes what Heidegger calls "Das Man".

Christian faith; Calvin substitutes the "It" of the Bible for the "We". He has much to say about the Holy Spirit in terms of the justification of the sinner and his rebirth as the child of God¹, and the union of man with God in Christ and through Christ². This is a great achievement, for unless the I or the Thou relationship of God and man is defined in some such sense as that in which Calvin explains it, the quest for the spiritual destiny of man is a hopeless task. In the Roman Catholic Church against which Calvin protested, man's individuality was sacrificed to the impersonal "We" - "the Church". It conceived the theonomy of Christian faith as the "We" and the "I and Thou" of God. The "We" - the Church - set itself between man and God, instead of revealing itself from within this relationship. When this occurs/

-
1. Alfred Gohler: Calvin's Lehre von der Heiligung (esp. II Kapitel: Die Wiedergeburt des Sünders durch den Heiligen Geist).
 2. v. W. Niesel, op.cit. p.212: "Der Abstand zwischen uns und Christus der diese Welt wirklich überwunden und verlassen hat und nun in der Welt Gottes weilt, kann nur durch eine Tat Gottes selber überwunden werden. Das geschieht durch die dritte Person der Trinität, durch die heimliche und unbegreifliche Kraft des hl. Geistes. Durch den Geist steigt Christus zu uns herab und hebt uns zugleich zu sich empor. Durch den Geist öffnet er dem Wort und der Sakramenten den Zugang zu unseren Herzen. Durch den Geist werden wir mit Jesus Christus verbunden und vereinigt, so dass wir mit Leib Seele und, Geist sein eigen werden".

occurs man's personality is sacrificed to an impersonal whole which enslaves him. Calvin liberated the "I" of man from its enslavement by the "We" and related the "I" of man directly to the Thou of God; for this relationship is revealed in Christ the God-man. But what Calvin forgot was that the personality of man thus liberated after having found the meaning of its destiny, in its ontological Godward direction, cannot stop there, but must proceed to extend the meaning of its destiny in an existential man-ward direction and unite these two dimensions in itself. Unless this is achieved the destiny of personality is not realised. The affirmation of the sinner by God as His child, must resolve itself in man's affirmation of the world and history¹. As man cannot find the meaning of his destiny in the ontological sense except through the Holy Spirit, so neither can he find the meaning of his destiny in the existential sense except through the Holy Spirit who grasps him from the I - Thou - We relationship. Though Calvin grants that the Holy Spirit abides in the Church and encounters us/

1. In this I see what Fr. Gogarten calls "man's taking upon himself the responsibility for history" (History & Demythologising).

us through it¹, he does not understand the full meaning of this fact and thus fails to give us a satisfactory doctrine of the Holy Spirit in whom the theonomy of Christian faith is fully revealed².

What Calvin has in the concept of the Bible, as the Word of God is in fact an interpretation of it which asserts the primacy of the I-Thou over against the "We". This is in principle hardly different from the use of the Bible by the Roman Catholic Church which finds in the Bible support for the supremacy of the "We" over against the "I" of man. The Bible is not free, however, from this ambiguity, when read in the atmosphere of the distorted doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Only in the Holy Spirit the "Supremacy" of either vanishes and their interdependence is revealed, showing their unity in the I of God, who meets us in Christ, through the Holy Spirit. It/

-
1. W. Niesel, op.cit. p.227 f: "Das gilt auch für den besondern Fall der Berufung in ein Amt der Kirche, Zur äusseren Berufung durch die Gemeinde gehört die innere durch den hl.Geist. Da niemand in das Herz eines anderen blicken kann, gilt der als "recht berufen" der vor der Gemeinde beauftragt worden ist! wenn aber die innere fehlt, ist er nichts als ein Mietling".
 2. There is no theonomy of Christian faith nor satisfactory doctrine of the Holy Spirit, except in the union of the I and the Thou of God and man with the "We" - the Christian fellowship, the Church.

It is here that man's quest for his destiny in its ontological and existential sense is realised.

3.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN REFORMED
THEOLOGY AFTER CALVIN.

(Literal Inspiration of The Holy Scripture).

In his remarkable book, 'Die Theologie Calvins', Wilhelm Niesel claims that one misunderstands Calvin if one ascribes to him the teaching of literal inspiration of Scripture. While one admits that Niesel's argument carries great weight and conviction, the fact still remains that Reformed theologians after Calvin taught this very doctrine, convinced that they were only following in the steps of the great Reformer. It is inconceivable that this was an independent development which could not be traced back to Calvin, especially when we think of his tremendous authority for theologians of the Reformed Church even in our own time. How can one account for this misunderstanding of Calvin if Niesel is right? One may, ^{say} if he so chooses to do, as Friedrich Gogarten¹ does in justifying Luther, that Luther (so we may say of/

1. v. Demythologising and History. p. 12 ff.

of Calvin also) understood the Word of God existentially; namely that the Word in Luther is always understood and interpreted in terms of its significance for and in human destiny. Those who followed Luther, (or in this connection, Calvin) 'objectivised' this existential understanding of the Word. For the original existential experience of the Word found in Luther faded and later theologians sought to understand the meaning of the Word in terms of its 'objectivised' form in Scripture. They did all they could to make this 'objectivised' form of the Word have ultimacy in the Reformers; hence they were driven to postulate the literal inspiration of Scripture. The foregoing argument may be used legitimately, to some degree, to justify Calvin. It seems to me clear, however, that Calvin's teaching engenders the view of the literal inspiration of Scripture. This lies in the fact that when he was challenged by the Anabaptists, who claimed that they possessed the Holy Spirit, Calvin argued that the test of whether the Holy Spirit indwells in a human being is whether the Holy Spirit teaches the person to abide or not to abide by the word of Holy Scripture¹. If not, as was the case with the Anabaptists, any claim of guidance by the Holy Spirit is false. The Anabaptists claimed/

1. 'Institutes' - Book I, ch. 9.

claimed that in possessing the Holy Spirit directly, their 'norm of authority' had the greatest ultimacy, cancelling and destroying all previous norms by which Christians were and are still bound. The Anabaptists considered themselves free from being subject to anything except the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. In Calvin's argument against this arbitrary interpretation of the Holy Spirit, lies the seed of the later doctrine of literal inspiration of Holy Scripture.¹ Calvin's theology engenders two views concerning the Scriptures. As a consequence/

-
1. In comparison with this argument of Calvin's, the argument from Sobornost is more in keeping with the New Testament Pneumatology. That is to say, that in New Testament revelation the Holy Spirit reveals Himself as the Creator of the 'Body of Christ' in history. This is the Christian Fellowship in which the I and Thou relationship of God and man unite in themselves and are revealed from within the 'we' - the Church, as the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, in which the Lordship of Christ is revealed. The 'test' of the claim of possession of the Holy Spirit is whether the action of those making the claim are directed towards destroying or upbuilding the unity of this fellowship, and its recognisable identity with itself through history. Both words - unity and identity - are meant in this connection sui generis and denote the realities which are discernable spiritually by the believer's personality; namely, that his destiny is realised in the togetherness of every I and Thou of God and man with the 'we' - the Church. This togetherness transcends time and space.

consequence of this ambiguity in Calvin, there arose in later Calvinism two interpretations of the Scriptures: one of them interprets the Scriptures as literally INSPIRED, both in form and in content. This view may also be called the Mechanistic view of Inspiration. The other interpretation, which may be described as ORGANIC, explains Inspiration of the Scriptures as containing not a divine Revelation interpreted as a law, but a Revelation which is a disclosure of God as He goes out to man to succour and redeem him. Here the content of the Bible stands above the form which is of secondary importance.

These two views have continually fought one against the other and constitute the inner drama of Reformed Theology. They are both also represented among our contemporaries, and are described as 'Higher Biblical Criticism' and 'Fundamentalism'. We propose to give a short survey of both views.

b. The Nature of Literal Inspiration of Scripture.

In 'Reformed Dogmatics', Heinrich Heppe says: "The older Reformed theology distinguished between the 'Word of God' and 'Holy Scripture' most definitely..... the latter dogmaticians on the contrary separating the idea of inspiration from that of revelation unanimously teach that the 'Word of God' rests, not upon God's personal/

personal acts of revelation, but upon the manner of their recording, upon inspiration¹. The whole idea of literal inspiration of Scripture may be best illustrated from Cocceius, "The men of God, called prophets in general parlance, were God's assistants and amanuenses, who wrote exactly as they spoke, not by their own will but driven by the Holy Spirit"².

It is a very well-known fact which does not need to be illustrated, that this was the accepted doctrine known to us as Protestant Orthodoxy. Scripture was described in its literal sense as 'Theopneustos'. The theology of this period may best be described as Christian Talmudism, and exploited Scripture to produce 'Canon Law' sui generis, which in spirit does not in any way differ from its counterpart in the Roman Catholic Church. In the Anglo-Saxon/

1. Ibid. p.15 (English translation). The whole of Chapter II, entitled 'The Holy Scripture', is an invaluable source of information as regards the doctrine of literal inspiration in Reformed theology.

2. Ibid. p. 17.
v. also 'The Inspiration of the Holy Scripture' by William Lee - Dublin, 1864, p.19:

"..... each and every such matter not only has been committed to writing under the infallible assistance and guidance of God, but is to be ascribed to the special and immediate suggestion, embreathement and dictation of the Holy Ghost".

Anglo-Saxon world, the classic example of this is the Westminster Confession of Faith. This view of the Bible was created by the Protestant doctrine of "God's Eternal Decree" (Vd. Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter III; also Scots Confession of Faith (1560), chapter VII).

Its motive is doctrinal. It is based on the logic that since the relationship between God and man is based on the Eternal Decree, God must have revealed this law to man, and this law is the Scriptures. As in the Law both form and content are fixed, so must the Bible be also.

The doctrine of the Literal Inspiration of the Scriptures safeguards completely the logic of this view, and it was accepted with rigid adherence. This conception of the Christian religion in terms of Law, though it may be called Absolute or Divine Law, robbed Christianity of its pneumatic nature. In Protestant Orthodoxy, the human destiny was contemplated, not in terms of the ever-occurring miracle of Divine freedom, which in Christ through the Holy Spirit enables man to transcend the chain of necessity and relativity of human existence and thus overcome it; but rather that this necessity acquires an absolute significance for God, for he judges it by the Law of the Scriptures. In Protestant Orthodoxy, the Holy Spirit was conceived as performing a negative role, i.e. creating

a code: Holy Scripture, which accuses man of his contingency and relativity in the world, rather than revealing to him transcendence in Christ as the possibility and reality of his existence¹.

In Protestant Orthodoxy, with its literal inspiration of Scripture, the human existence does not reveal the theonomy of Christian faith as the foretaste of the Kingdom of God under the conditions of human existence in the world, although this is its meaning insofar as it is grasped by and participates in the revelation of God in Christ. But rather for this theonomy, which is the existential reality of Christian faith there is substituted an 'objectivised' form of it - Holy Scripture, literally inspired, interpreting the meaning of Christian faith. The Christian faith is understood to mean here what it does not primarily mean; that God is judge of human relativity. This implicitly means that God judges the non-being directly. This is the reductio ad absurdum of Christian/

1. I am not saying here that Christian revelation does not judge the relativity and contingency of human existence, But this is a secondary element in it, the primary element being revelation of the possibilities of human existence through Christ and the Holy Spirit, what the Greek Fathers called 'the theosis of man'. The judgment upon the contingency of human existence here and now is the negative aspect of the primary element and as such is non-being. This non-being was treated by Protestant Orthodoxy as the reality which God treats as being. This is rationalisation of non-being and as such blasphemy against Christian revelation. Protestant Orthodoxy made Christian revelation into religion while its meaning lies in overcoming religion.

Christian faith, understood from the standpoint of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In Protestant Orthodoxy, the death-blow was given to the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and therefore it is not surprising that this doctrine to all intents and purposes has vanished from liberal Protestantism¹. The understanding of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in Protestant Orthodoxy is nearer to that of the Old than of the New Testament.

* * * * *

c. The Nature of the 'Organic' Inspiration of Scripture.

As the history of Reformed Christianity shows, many theologians of the Reformed Church felt unhappy about the interpretation of the Christian Revelation in terms of rigid determinism imposed upon it by the Protestant doctrine of the Divine Decree. It was realised that Christian experience does not warrant this view, and a new approach to the problem of the Inspiration of the Scriptures was sought. And finally the way towards a more personalistic understanding of the Scriptures was formulated. This view of Inspiration may best be described in the words of William Lee²: "In whatever manner we/

1. I am thinking here about Liberal Protestantism on the Continent.

2. Op. cit. p.23

we conceive the Bible to convey to us a Revelation, we must from the nature of the case, recognise its two elements. Without the divine element, Scripture would cease to be Revelation; without the human, the communication from God would have been confined to the person or persons to whom it was originally made." This view differs theologically from the other, and was resisted by the staunch adherents of the Protestant Orthodoxy. This conflict in the Anglo-Saxon world may best be illustrated from the case of Professor W. Robertson Smith who was tried for heresy in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland in 1881¹. The uproar started by Robertson Smith's article on the Bible in the IX edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In this article he propounded views concerning the authorship of certain books of the Bible similar to those of Graf-Wellhausen. The champions of Orthodoxy suspected him of denouncing the whole idea of the inspiration of the Bible, because for them, as has been shown, the content and the 'form' of the Bible were an indestructible unity. Robertson Smith defended himself by declaring that he in no way diminished the Reformed doctrine./

1. It is not my intention to discuss this actual case. My statements are chiefly based on P. Carnegie Simpson: 'The Life of Principal Rainy', Vol. I, pp.306-403 (Hodder & Stoughton, 1909).

doctrine, for he asserted that he too believed in the inspiration of the Bible, but he held that this inspiration must be understood to lie in the content of the Bible as the Word of God, and not in its external form, which scholars have a right to discuss. He asserted that his view led people to understand the meaning of the "great Reformation doctrine of Scripture, which bases its inspiration not on any external things such as authorship or literary construction, but on the Testimonium Sancti Spiritus, which criticism can never touch".¹

The views of Robertson Smith became prevalent and at present Reformed theology is characterised by the truce between both schools. Of the schools, the second one is by far the more favourable to the creative theology concerning the Holy Spirit. Its drawback is its 'bad memory' of the oppressive and depersonalising views of its opponent's school, and it tends to overshadow Pneumatology by Anthropology. At present we are witnessing the consequences of the weakness inherent in the second school. The New Testament theology of Professor R. Bultmann and its popularity is a case in point.² The reconciliation of these two schools and the solution of the crisis in Reformed/

-
1. My statements are chiefly based on P. Carnegie Simpson: 'The Life of Principal Rainy', Vol. I, pp. 306-403 (Hodder & Stoughton, 1909).
Ibid. p. 334. Speaking of the views of Robertson Smith, P. Carnegie Simpson says: "He restated his high evangelical doctrine of inspiration in a way that at once convinced men and moved them". (ibid. p. 337)
 2. Professor R. Bultmann is of course a Lutheran, but his theology is favourably accepted by many Reformed theologians.

Reformed theology which their conflict is causing may be, I believe, overcome only by the more dynamic and personalistic theology based on the unity of Christology and Pneumatology.

Classical Reformed Theology was not unaware of this problem. It thought to have solved it by the doctrine of the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. But this great doctrine does not contain an adequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it is too individualistic, it has a danger of turning a believer in monologue with himself, while the task of true Pneumatology is to draw him out of himself and reveal his own self-relatedness as the consequence of his being in dialogue with God and those who, like him, participate in God's revelation.

* * * * *

4.

A SHORT STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE THEOLOGY OF KARL BARTH AND EMIL BRUNNER.

(Scripture as the Norm of Christian Faith).

Contemporary reformed theology has been described as Neo-Calvinism. The term Neo-Calvinism denotes its departure from Protestant Orthodoxy. The Neo-Calvinists claim that theirs is a theology of return to the original teaching of the Reformers. Emil Brunner expresses this view thus: "All we are trying to do is to free the newly discovered/

discovered Scriptural principle of the Reformers from the traditional orthodox, formally axiomatic faith in the Bible, and to show clearly what the teachers of the Reformation period never succeeded in doing, although in principle we owe this truth to them..... the Scriptures are the absolute authority in so far as in them the revelation, Jesus Christ is supreme".¹ The modern Reformed Theology of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner dissociates itself from the claim of Protestant Orthodoxy that Scripture has autonomously a supreme authority as the norm of Christian faith. This norm is to be found only in Jesus the Christ, the Revealer of God to man. There cannot be any question of identifying Scripture with revelation. "The Bible," for Barth, says Otto Weber, "is a witness. Consequently it itself is not the thing that is attested. It is to be distinguished from revelation insofar as it is only a human word about it".²

While both Barth and Brunner postulate the ultimacy of authority in Christian faith in Jesus the Christ, this does not mean that the Bible is not a sine qua non for the believer. "We remain within the Scriptures, not, it is true, as an authority but as the source of all that truth which/

1. Emil Brunner - 'Dogmatics', p. 49, Vol. I

2. Otto Weber - 'Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics', p.57

which possesses absolute authority"¹. Barth explains the significance of the Bible thus, "that Holy Scripture, as the original and legitimate witness to God's revelation is God's Word itself"². Barth here does not make an identification of the Word of God with the Scriptures as Protestant Orthodoxy did. The apparent identification in Barth must be understood in term of Kerygma of the Christian Church, in which the original act, the Word made flesh - Jesus the Christ, is present.³.

b. The Problem of Authority in the Theology of Barth and Brunner.

Both Barth and Brunner are anxious to safeguard the Bible/

1. Emil Brunner - ibid p.47

2. Otto Weber - ibid p.59

3. Friedrich Gogarten 'History and Demythologising' p.68:

"Kerygma is already a happening; at the moment of its announcement what is announced becomes reality. Just as the Word of Jesus is the Word of God, so that whoever hears Him hears God, so too therefore is the proclamation of those whom Jesus sends as His messengers: His own proclamation, so that it can be said of them 'he that heareth you heareth me' (Lk. 10-16). 'God's Word is God Himself in the proclamation of the Church of Jesus Christ'. Karl Barth quoted by Otto Weber, ibid. p.68

Bible as the court of appeal in matters of faith, so as to match the Roman Catholic principle of authority with the Protestant principle of authority in the Church. "The Church does claim direct, absolute, and material authority for herself", says Karl Barth, "but solely for Holy Scripture as God's Word"¹. Emil Brunner explains that this authority of Scripture derives from the fact that in them is found the witness of the Apostles². This is sufficient to cancel the Roman Catholic claim of appeal to the Pope as the bearer of Apostolic tradition and authority. But while using the 'authority' of the Bible against the claim of authority in the Roman Catholic Church, both Barth and Brunner deny categorically that they are setting up the authority of a "paper pope"³. Thus Brunner says: "while we are bound in an absolute sense/

1. Otto Weber - *ibid.* p.61

2. Emil Brunner - *ibid.* p.47

3. This principle of external authority vitiates the whole of the theology of Western Christianity. It is a demon which corrupts it, and must be exorcised. This problem of external authority vitiates the understanding of the theonomy of Christian faith in Western theology, for it suspects it of pure subjectivity which is anarchy in disguise. The greatest contribution which Eastern Orthodox theology has to make to theological science is its insistence upon the theonomy of Christian faith over against the principle of external authority in the Church.

sense to the medium, to the means of revelation of the Apostolic witness, we are only bound in a relative sense to the authority of this witness"¹. Both Barth and Brunner acknowledge the human character of the Bible. "The Scripture", says Brunner, "first of all the testimony of the Apostles to Christ - is the Crib wherein Christ lieth" (Luther). It is a "word" inspired by the Spirit of God; yet at the same time it is a human message; its "human character" means that it is coloured by the frailty and imperfection of all that is human"². This problem of the nature of authority in Barth and Brunner will become clearer as we proceed.

c. The Interpretation of the Word by Barth and Brunner.

Both Barth and Brunner interpret the Word of God in terms of the Person of Jesus the Christ. Barth is more abstract, and describes the Divine encounter with man in the Word as self-authentication of truth, which demands subjection to itself. This is due to Barth's insistence upon the depravity of man. For Barth, the self-authentication of the Word, in the Kerygma, testifies that the Word is the Truth. Because of this, Barth places great emphasis/

1. E. Brunner - ibid. p.47

2. E. Brunner - ibid. p.34

emphasis upon Kerygma¹. For Brunner, the Divine-human encounter is explained more personalistically; he speaks about this encounter (die Begegnung) in terms of the witness of the Holy Spirit within human spirit, uniting divine and human freedom, as this is spoken of in the New Testament/

1. During my studies under Barth in a Seminar dealing with the problem of contemporaneity of Christ, Barth said this contemporaneity must be understood in terms of the contemporaneity of the Kerygma. I said to Barth that the personalistic nature of this contemporaneity or presence of Christ with us, demands from the theologians a description of this contemporaneity in terms of the abiding of the Holy Spirit with believers, revealing the Lordship of Christ. Barth agreed. Knowing Barth's passionate defence of the Doctrine of Filioque I added, "moreover, in the abiding of the Holy Spirit the Father witnesses to us on the Son's behalf, that He is the Lord. In doing this, the Father renounces Himself on the Son's behalf as the Son renounced Himself in the earthly ministry of Christ, on the Father's behalf, seeking the Father's and not His own glory. In the experience of the Holy Spirit abiding with believers it is not Christ directly witnessing to Himself, but it is the Father's witness concerning the Son, therefore, it is difficult to speak of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son but from the Father alone". Barth remembering that I was an Eastern Orthodox, answered: "In the West, when we say 'the Son' we mean the Holy Spirit also".

Testament (Gal.4.6 - Rom. 8.15 ff; I Cor. 2:16 ff)¹.

Barth, who is aware of the pitfalls of interpreting Christian faith in terms of the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, due perhaps to its secularised form in liberal Protestantism, which taught that religion is essentially feeling, speaks rather of the Bible as the Word of God in a more 'objective sense' as self-interpreting². "Scripture is recognised as God's Word by the fact that it is God's Word"³. Barth with his emphasis on 'objectivity' does not deny the Pneumatological understanding of the Bible. He explicitly says, "as God in His revelation is no less the Holy Spirit than the Son, so God's Word in Scripture is no less Spirit than it is Word"⁴. But he rightly insists that the Holy Spirit must/

1. E. Brunner - *ibid.* p.30 ff.

2. "Modern Protestantism is handing us over to the 'God in our own hearts', is simply the erection of tyrannical authority and not the freedom proclaimed by it. 'Who can be a worse tyrant for us than the God in our own hearts?'" Karl Barth, *vide* the summary of his teaching by Otto Weber, *ibid.* p.66

3. *Ibid.* p.61

4. *v.* Otto Weber, *ibid.* p.65

must be understood in terms of the Divine freedom which stands over against man. This is a very important advance in the development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Protestantism, which to all intents and purposes, confined Him not to the subjectivity of human freedom, which though not the complete truth about Him, would have been better than the way in which Protestantism described Him all along as a submission of human freedom to the Divine Will. The Holy Spirit is, in fact, the union of the divine and human freedom which implies their standing over against each other. Karl Barth is right when he speaks about the Holy Spirit in terms of the objectivity of divine freedom but this is only one side of a movement which must be complemented by describing the Holy Spirit also in terms of human freedom as the second side of the movement from which He also reveals Himself.

Criticisms of Barth and Brunner.

From the standpoint of the foregoing survey of Barth's and Brunner's theology it may be said that their theology implies great progress from the standpoint of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Their dissociation from the interpretation of Christian revelation in terms of Law or Doctrine, which implies the absolutism of the Bible, and their insistence on the interpretation of revelation in terms of the personality of Jesus the Christ, and the subordination/

subordination of the Bible to this norm cannot be sufficiently commended. A new dimension of understanding of God, His freedom and personality, is opened up which lifts man out of the understanding of himself, before God, in terms of abstract concepts as one who obeys the Law set before him in a set of propositions, or whose freedom is at the mercy of a doctrine which he must adhere to or be damned. In old Protestant Orthodoxy the anxiety of human existence which is in the world and seeks to transcend it, here turns upon itself and appears in a guise of transcendence, in the form of a Bible interpreted as a Divine Law or doctrine. Barth and Brunner break the spell of this pseudo-transcendence. In their theology God encounters man in His freedom, not in Law or doctrine. This promises to man freedom, destiny, and personality. The Scripture is put by them in subservience to these personalistic elements in God and man, rather than allowed to overshadow them. Nevertheless, they both fail to assert what the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit surely demands, that the Bible is not only subservient to the I and Thou relationship of God and man, but as the I and Thou relationship of God and man is an unbreakable unity of the I-Thou and We, so the Bible is subservient to this unity as a whole. The foretaste of the Kingdom of God lies under the conditions of human/

human existence and could theologically only be meaningfully appreciated, if this 'triune' relationship, this expression of the theonomy of being in Christian revelation is conceived personalistically as a unity creative of itself. What Barth and Brunner do in order to safeguard the Protestant principle of authority, is to subject the Bible to the I and Thou relationship of God and man. This is how I understand their insistence that the Person of Jesus the Christ in whom God meets us in revelation is the norm to which Scripture is subject. But they immediately set up the Bible, with a different view of it, it is true, from Protestant Orthodoxy, as creative and determinative of the We, the Church. This is as false as the Roman Catholic claim that the Apostolic hierarchy, exemplified in the office of the Pope, is creative and determinative of the Church. In Barth and Brunner the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is distorted for they fail to point out that the Holy Spirit reveals Himself simultaneously from the unity of the I and Thou relationship of God and man, with and from its unity with the We, which engenders the I and Thou relationship in itself and is engendered in it. Neo-Calvinism is guilty of ascribing the personalistic meaning of the Christian fellowship not to the Holy Spirit, who makes it the Body of Christ, but ultimately to the Bible, and that in spite of all they say about its human character. This creation of the Christian fellowship/

fellowship by the pseudo-transcendence of the Bible (for the Bible has not and cannot have transcendence) is the untruth about the Christian fellowship which every worshipper who has experienced its Sobornost, especially in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, would refuse to accept, when described as created by any other transcendence but that unconditional one of Christ and the Holy Spirit. And if in the Christian fellowship Christ is revealed by the Holy Spirit as the Lord, as the New Testament and experience of Sobornost testifies, then surely the Bible is not its Creator, though the Christian fellowship acknowledges the Bible as its written record which witnesses to the transcendence and the spiritual destiny of this fellowship in Jesus the Christ whom the Holy Spirit reveals as its Lord. The Bible is not the norm of the Christian fellowship, as an external authority of any kind. Not even is Jesus the Christ the external authority of the Church. The Church knows only the authority of truth, i.e. the revelation of the Lordship of Christ in the Church. The truth of the Lordship of Christ is all-abiding for the believer but it cannot be made an external authority. For in this moment it ceases to be theonomous, that is to say, gathering man in itself, by revealing to him the mystery of Divine-human union in Christ. The Lordship of Christ conceived as the external authority/

authority cuts off man and God from each other. In the Church the authority (not external) of Jesus the Christ is revealed, through the constellation of all charismata, working interdependently in the Church, supporting each other, and not lording it over each other in terms of external authority. It is difficult to convince legalistic empirical minds in Roman Catholicism and Protestantism that this theonomy of being in Christian revelation does not mean anarchy, but concrete order sui generis, not created by external authority but by itself and from within itself, revealing the Holy Spirit in whom the unity of man and God within the Church, and the Church within this unity of God and man in Christ, through the Holy Spirit exists.

When the Bible is understood, however, as the written record of this theonomy, it is indeed the Word of God, about man and to man, and also man's word about God, and as such the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church. Conceived in this way, the Bible is indeed divinely inspired, indispensable in witnessing to the Church, through the Holy Spirit, that Jesus is the Lord of the believer's I, because He is the Lord of the We, and as such, the ground of human personality, which by the Holy Spirit overcomes all separations by which the human self is threatened in the/

the world. This vision and experience may be best described by the saying in St. Luke's Gospel: "The Kingdom of God is within you". (Luke 20-17 A.V)

Only the Christian who recognises the theonomy of being in Christian revelation, as the inseparable unity of the I of man with Thou of God in the unity of the We - the Church, as the sine qua non of the destiny of his personality, and the existential reality of his being, is able to overcome the fall in what Heidegger calls 'das Man'. Even if he continually extols the I and Thou relationship of God and man, disregarding its inseparable unity with the We, he is in the clutches of 'das Man', for such a man does not really bear in himself the image of the Kingdom of God in the fullest sense, which is theonomous in this 'triune' sense. This must be a caveat to all theologians and their respective Churches.

* * * * *

APPENDIX 'A'.

Is Calvin a 'Fundamentalist'?

Many students of Calvin are not sure how to answer this question. In the foregoing essay I have mentioned already why Calvin was driven to a position which makes him an apparent 'fundamentalist'. Nevertheless, a student of Calvin is aware that he differs from the modern fundamentalists in this sense, that for him, at any rate, the letter of Scripture is subject to interpretation by the Holy Spirit, who reveals in Scripture the Word, the existential address of God to man. The modern fundamentalist, on the other hand, stresses the objective side of Scripture, the letter thereof carries finality, the Scripture is the Divine Truth by itself. In fundamentalism, Calvin's stress on the subjective side of revelation - the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit - is absent, and this makes Calvin's and their view of Scripture different. When Calvin and the fundamentalists say that God is the author of the Bible, they mean it in a different sense. The Calvinist theologian Heinrich Heppe says, that for Calvin there is no word of a peculiar inspiration of the record. "The authority of Scripture then rests not upon the form of its recording but upon its contents, i.e. upon the reality of the revealed facts attested in the writing. Hence God is described not so much as the 'author' of Scripture, as rather the author of the doctrine attested in it, which He Himself has announced to men" (1) Wilhelm Niesel in his book "Die Theologie Calvins" says about Calvin, "Mag er auch ganz gelegentlich davon sprechen, das die Heilige Schrift gottlich inspiriert sei, so ist das auf keinen Fall so zu verstehen, als ware die Schrift als solche die Wahrheit Gottes. Nein, die Wahrheit Gottes is Jesus Christus, der Mittler, unser Herr, und nicht ein in der Bibel gleichsam incarnierte Geist" (2)

-
1. Heinrich Heppe - "Reformed Dogmatics" English trans. p.16.

vide also: Jean Calvin: "Pensees sur Le Saint-Esprit". p.19

(Editions Calviniennes. M.E.Bienz. Geneve. Pentecote 1936)

2. Ibid. p.33
(The question: Is Calvin a 'Fundamentalist'? has been dealt with here because the present day fundamentalists claim him as their predecessor).

APPENDIX 'B'

In this essay the term "theonomy of being in Christian faith" has been used very often. The understanding of this concept is of great importance for the understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit reveals this theonomy of being in Christian faith from within Himself and is revealed in turn by it. The New Testament foundation for the concept "theonomy of being in Christian faith" lies in the two commandments of the New Testament; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.... and thy neighbour as thyself". (Mark 12:30 ff) (Matt. 22:36 ff) (Luke 10:27 ff). In the First Epistle of St. John, chapter 4, and especially verse 20, these two commandments are described as interdependent and only real in their mutuality. They are emphatically set out as integral to the structure of Christian revelation and cannot be separated without destroying the nature of that revelation. The first commandment denotes what I have called "the I and Thou" relationship of God and man. The second commandment implies the concept of the "we". This unity of the I-Thou and we 'creates', or rather reveals from within itself, that it is not a human but Divine creation, though it appears to be a 'commandment' - an act of human creativeness. (The word 'commandment' used in pointing out the two-sidedness of love in Christian faith is contradictory to the object of its injunction, namely, love, for love cannot be ordered but only revealed). Therefore, faith in God (love for Him) implies love for one's neighbour, which is ipso facto a creation of the Christian fellowship and is the Christian fellowship - the Church. There is no true faith in God (the I and Thou relationship) without faith in (and love for) the Christian fellowship (the "we")-the Church. It cannot be repeated sufficiently that there is no Christian fellowship (the "we") - the Church - if it is not grounded in and constantly revealing from within itself the I and Thou relationship of God and man. And also, it must be pointed out explicitly that God according to Christian revelation, disclaims any acknowledgment of Himself without acknowledgment of man - the "we". This does not mean that we postulate any relationship of God and man in terms of analogia entis; such a concept is alien to Christian revelation; but rather we speak of analogia amoris, to which Christian revelation bears witness, and which is the most stupendous miracle of Christian faith. (I have attempted to explain the meaning of love in Christian revelation in this thesis, and hope to be understood in what I mean by analogia amoris here). In the unity of the I-Thou-We, lies the theonomy of Christian faith which is the only true basis for the understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

APPENDIX 'C'Difficulties for the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Protestantism.

A student of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Christian revelation is aware that any reconsideration of this doctrine raises the problem of the reconsidering of all other Christian doctrines, because of the central position which this neglected doctrine occupies or should occupy in Christianity. In my studies of this doctrine I have been constantly aware that the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit raises an urgent reconsideration of the Christian doctrine of man. In the light of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit the problem of human personality, which raises the problem of its freedom, demands constant reconsideration. God's freedom reveals itself to man precisely in the act of revelation of the freedom of human personality. This freedom excludes the possibility of any arcana concilia which determines The Divine-human relationship. If there be any arcana concilia the implication would be that fatalism invades Divine and human freedom; this is completely contradictory to the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who reveals in Himself that Divine and human freedom are not conditioned by any law, i.e. arcana concilia. Human freedom experiences its unconditionality by finding its own meaning and fulfilment in the man-ward expression of Divine freedom, which is the Holy Spirit in whom the fellowship (the communion, the Sobornost) of God and man is revealed.

In Protestantism, the Doctrine of Predestination (in its supra and infralapsarian aspects) stands in contradiction to the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is a denial of the Doctrine of Predestination. The Holy Spirit in Christian revelation denotes the absence of fatalism in Divine Being and in human destiny which the Doctrine of Predestination implies. Predestination impairs the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and hence both the doctrine of God and man become distorted. The Doctrine of Predestination is a rationalisation which ascribes to the Divine freedom the phenomenon found in human freedom; namely, its unwillingness to meet Divine freedom unconditionally as Divine freedom meets human freedom unconditionally. This is because it is afraid lest this unconditionality implies a threat to human freedom and therefore to human personality, loss of self-identity. Herein lies the reason why man still contemplates Divine-human relationships in terms of the Old Testament, i.e. Law; rather than of the New Testament, i.e. the Holy/

Holy Spirit. Man contemplates the Divine-human relationship in terms of Law, for he 'objectivises' the Divine-human encounter in order to make God's freedom comprehensible and takes away from it its unconditional character which he thinks contains a threat to his own freedom. This is man's lack of understanding of the Holy Spirit who is the Source of both Divine and human freedom, and who strives to reveal Himself from within the human freedom in order to assert it as He reveals Himself from within the Divine freedom, which is asserted in Him. This the Holy Spirit does in order to manifest in Himself and from within Himself the fellowship between God and man. In doing so, the Holy Spirit proclaims Jesus the Christ as the Lord over human existence. For, in Jesus the Christ, the Holy Spirit has revealed in human existence God's freedom giving itself completely to man's freedom, and man's freedom responding to the Divine freedom unconditionally. From within the unity of the Divine and human freedom of Christ, the Holy Spirit reveals Himself. This does not mean that He proceeds from Christ, if procession means that Christ is the origin of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is prior to His revelation in Christ, for He brings about the unity of the Divine-human freedom in Christ. The Doctrine of Predestination suggests that God, like man, is afraid that He may lose Himself in abandonment to human freedom, and assures Himself from this by arctana concilia. God does not need this, for in expressing the unconditionality of His own freedom, manifested in its risks while seeking to succour human freedom from non-being, by calling it into fellowship with itself; the Holy Spirit reveals the identity of Divine personality with itself.

* * * * *

A P P E N D I X A

AN ESSAY ON

O L D T E S T A M E N T I D E A S

CONCERNING

T H E S P I R I T O F G O D

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The appearance of Christianity in history is a consequence of the revelation of God in Christ and the Holy Spirit.

Christian theology speaks paradoxically about this revelation, for it claims its uniqueness as something to be found nowhere else but in the New Testament. Yet it asserts that this revelation begins with the Old Testament which is also considered to be divine revelation. But this paradox is more apparent than real. The Old Testament revelation is not divine revelation in the absolute sense as is the case with the New Testament Revelation. The Old Testament Revelation does not contain in itself the fullness of the revelation of God. Rather, it points to it, and its significance lies in preparing the minds of men who belonged to the pre-Christian era, for the coming of the Messiah in whom the full divine disclosure was expected.

The Old Testament is therefore not the revelation: it is expectatio revelationis. All its meaning is a closed book until the Messiah reveals it at His coming. He alone can make Old Testament history Heilige Geschichte, and the Old Testament preparation for revelation into the revelation

/proper.

proper.

Christians to whom, in Jesus of Nazareth the Christ, the Messiah was revealed, accepted the Old Testament scriptures as the record of the divine revelation, on the condition that it be interpreted not per se but in the light of its fulfilment in the New Testament, which is foreshadowed in the Old. This is still essential Christian doctrine. The Old Testament contains in itself the typological representation of the New. Christian dogmatists in their study of the New Testament doctrines turned to the Old Testament in order^{to} to comprehend them more fully through their prototypes in the Old Testament.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which is a New Testament doctrine par excellence, has, like Christology, its own preparatio evangelica in the Old Testament. This has made it necessary to add to this thesis a study of the Old Testament conception of the Spirit since this has made such an important contribution to the Christian understanding of the Holy Spirit of the New Testament revelation.

The conceptions of the Spirit in the Old and New Testaments are not identical, but neither are they divergent. They re-interpret rather than contradict each other. This is because the God of the Old Testament is not in His presentation the same as God the

-3-

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom Christ portr
reveals in His own person. And yet they
are not two Gods, (as Marcion thought), but one -
faintly seen in the Old Testament, but fully revealed
in the New Testament. When the New Testament is
made a norm for the Old Testament, then the latter
makes a fruitful contribution to the study of the
doctrine of the New Testament revelation.

The concept of the Spirit in the Old Testament
is difficult to define adequately, since it is applied
to a variety of phenomena concerning the world, man
and God. Since the study of this thesis is the
doctrine of God in terms of Pneumatology, this essay
proposes to examine what light the conception of the
Spirit in the Old Testament, throws on the nature
and character of God in His relation to the world
and man. In the language of the New Testament, God
reveals what is revealed through the Spirit, for
"the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of
God" (1 Cor.2.10.)

The Old Testament Weltanschauung, like that of
the New, is theocentric. The meaning of any concept
of the Old Testament Scriptures can only be grasped
when considered in relationship with this theocentri-
city, and particularly so for the understanding of
the meaning of the spirit in the Old Testament. What-
ever the Kuach, (the Spirit), may mean in particular

instances, essentially and primarily it speaks of God. It is God's spirit, even when it appears to bear an anthropomorphic and cosmological significance. The world and man are never self centred, even when they appear to be, for they are the creation of God and are God centred. They have no Ruach of their own, only one delegated from Yahweh, by Whom they are what they are.

It is proposed to summarise the Old Testament doctrine concerning the Spirit, by discussing three topics which had a deep effect on the mind of Old Testament man, namely

1. The mystery of existence and life in general.
2. The Ruach of God as the source of moral order.
3. History as the stage for God's action.

These three problems are inter-related in the thought of Old Testament man and must be understood as one whole in spite of their division in this essay into separate chapters.

THE MYSTERY OF EXISTENCE AND LIFE IN GENERAL

At the very beginning of the Old Testament Scriptures, in the first account of Creation, the Bible postulates the Spirit of God as the life-giving principle. "In the Beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters." (Gen.1.1-2; cf. Is.42.5). In the second account of creation, where we find more particular detail of the creation of man, the biblical writer says, "then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." (Gen.2.7) (2)

In these two statements we have a concise expression of the idea that the world and man originated in the creativeness of the Spirit which is from God and is God. (3) (v. Zech.12.1). Further biblical references expand on this theme with concrete examples. Thus Job says, "By the Spirit of God the heavens are made bright." (v. Job 26.13) (4); Elihu in Job 33.4 says, "The Spirit of God has made me and the breath of the Almighty gives me life". The examples could be multiplied. The religious mind of the Hebrew in the Old Testament judges the reality of the creation by the measure of the presence of God in it. This is illuminating religious insight into the mystery of creation. Thus in Psalm 104.27-30 - "These all look to thee, to give them their food in due season. When thou givest to them, they gather it up; when thou openest thy hand, they are filled with good things. When thou hidest thy face, they are dismayed; when thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust. When thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground." The creating Spirit of God pervades all things. Without the Spirit there would be no life. (v. Ps.143.7; Is.32.14,15). The writer of Psalm 137, has, with deep religious insight, expressed how the presence of the spirit cannot be evaded for the very essence of life is conceived by its creativeness and owes all to its presence. "Thou didst form my inward parts, thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb." (v.13) And there is no point in asking where one may flee from God's spirit. Such a thought is futile and meaningless. It follows that the things in which the Spirit finds expression are the only true realities, for God is their ontological ground of being and they are therefore imperishable. (Is.31.3) (Is.31.3) (5)

But the mystery of life is not only observed in external phenomena. Man experiences within himself the ebbing and flowing of the creative energy of the spirit in the changing feelings of weakness and power in his mental and emotional experiences, which were to the Israelite Bedouin signs of the absence or presence of the Spirit. These experiences caused him to postulate a power beyond himself and nature; which was manifested in both himself and in nature and which conditioned both. When we bear in mind that primitive man almost everywhere else has explained the divine as being within man and nature, and very often as synonymous with nature, it is remarkable that Hebrew thought transcended to a large degree the idea of the immediate as divine, and sought God beyond the field of the immediate environment. (6) This defended Old Testament religion from degenerating into magic as did the religions of other neighbouring countries.

This experience of the life within as a direct creation of the Spirit of God lead unavoidably to an anthropomorphic interpretation of God and His Spirit Who is the source of all life. The Israelite's anthropomorphic understanding of God grow from its cruder into a more spiritual form through the rise of personal, moral consciousness which was heightened by prophetic teaching. (7)

The recognition of this anthropomorphism in the Hebrew understanding of God is helpful in the understanding of the dual appraisal of the nature of creation in the Old Testament. In Genesis 1.31, God looked upon His creation, including man, "and behold, it was very good" and in Job 38.4 ff. "when I laid the foundation of the earth ... all the sons of God shouted for joy". Yet, in Genesis 6, after man had proved to be less than His creator meant him to be, "the Lord was sorry that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart. So the Lord said, 'I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the ground', man and beast and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them." (vv.6,7) In verse 3, God is represented as saying, "My spirit shall not abide in man for ever," for he is flesh.

This moral approval and existential denial of man and the world, we must not allow to be explained as contradictory qualities in God and His Spirit. Rather, we must accept the antithesis as a human interpretation of the purpose of God. Man found himself experiencing life and existence in a two-fold way, corresponding to the two sides of his nature, 'being' and 'becoming'.

-3-

'Being' is always an affirmation: 'Becoming' appears essentially as a negation, and through the process of interplay between the two, - which put man in conflict and tension - he has to come to terms with the world and his own existence. Being incapable of seeing the unity of 'being' and 'becoming', he sees instead the dualism within himself and the world. He argues that the Creator of Life ordered this dualism. The religious Hebrew contemplating on his own experiences, explains them 'theologically' by ascribing to God a two-fold attitude toward the world. In other words, God was understood, and consequently explained, in terms of crude anthropomorphism. But the Creator-Spirit, as we see from the New Testament, has no negative attitude towards the world and man, for 'the spirit helps us in our weakness', and this bearing of our infirmities by the Spirit is closely connected with the promise that the Creation which 'has been groaning in travail' will be set free and obtain the 'glorious liberty of the children of God'. St. Paul teaches, (Romans 8.19) that not only man redeemed by Christ, but the whole creation has a spiritual destiny, for 'it waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God.' So in the New Testament we have a complete overcoming of the dualism existent in the Old Testament. The singleness of purpose of the Spirit of God has been better understood, for the Spirit does not turn from His positive attitude of creating, to the negative one of destroying.

The resolution of the duality is even partly seen in the Old Testament. The prophet Isaiah says of God, "For I will not contend for ever, nor will I always be angry;

for from me proceeds the spirit, and I have made the breath of life." Is. 57.16

From this we may conclude that in all its activities, the Spirit of God in the Old Testament accomplishes a positive and creative purpose within God's creation, which comes into existence through the instrumentality of the Spirit. The Spirit is working not to destroy, but to transform God's Creation into the Reality which is not threatened by the destruction of the forces within itself. Though God's Spirit is engaged in creating and recreating the world and man, this must not be understood as the dialectic of creating and destroying by which God's Spirit is expressing itself. It is even false for a man to see the

/creativity

* Romans 8.

creativity of his own spirit thus, (though there is more justification in describing it rather than the Holy Spirit so); for man's existence is not characterised by the dialectic of the creative and destructive activity of his spirit, but of constant creativeness through the transformation of his being within which the human spirit is active. This occurs at the deepest level of being and though this creative transformation appears as a negation, it is in fact directed towards the affirmation of being and is never negation other than when man's spirit is alienated from participating in his existence and then acts destructively as in pathological cases such as various kinds of 'demonic possession', such as Superbia, Invidia, and the like.

This much we can infer about the nature of creation from the Old Testament conception of it, as springing from the Ruach of God. (8)

To sum up. The Old Testament regard the creativeness of the Ruach of God as the source of life. A quotation from A. B. Davidson's "Theology of the Old Testament" puts this most expressively:-

"The Spirit of God gives creatures life, and when withdrawn, leaves them dead ... all this seems to mean that the vitality of all creatures is due to God, to God's operation. God is the source of all life, and as God, He is continually communicating His life. But God's operation or efficiency is the Spirit of God, and God's operation in giving the creature life, is the entrance of His Spirit into the creature. His continuous efficiency in upholding life is the continuous presence of His Spirit. His cessation to uphold life is the withdrawal of His Spirit"

Notes:- Mystery of
Existence

1. Cf. Eccles. 12.7; Job 27.3; the Hebrew term used here is 'Neshama', not 'Ruach' which is the usual term for the creative energising power of God. However, the Old Testament scholars in this instance see an identity between the two terms. A. Johnson in "The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel" maintains that the two terms are interchangeable, though he says we may well reserve judgment whether or no the transition from 'Neshama' to 'Ruach' took place before the exile. (v. p.32) 'Neshama' is used only twenty-seven times in the Bible, while 'Ruach' is used three hundred and seventy eight. (v. H. Wheeler Robinson: "The Christian Doctrine of Man", p.15, and also Norman H. Snaith: "The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament", p.149, where he comments on Job 32.8.)

2. The Hebrew term used is 'Nephesh'. In understanding this term I think that one must keep in mind that in the beginning Nephesh was created and as such is always subordinate to Ruach. Nephesh is widely used of man and Ruach of God. If George Knight had had this in mind when writing his book "From Moses to Paul", pp.40ff, he would not have 'put the cart before the horse' by applying 'Nephesh' to God and explaining His nature by a term which is only used of man. Even when 'Nephesh' is used in connection with man it is only in his relationship to the Spirit of God, who is its *raison d'être* and the Absolute on which man's creaturely existence depends. While *nephesh* (psyche-anima) is predicated freely of irrational animals as well as of human beings, *ruach* is rarely used except in reference to man or to God, in whom image man is made. No Hebrew writer speaks of the 'soul' of God; but of the Spirit of God more frequent mention is made than of the spirit of man.

H.B. Swete: The Holy Spirit
in the New Testament, p.2

It is true that when the nature of God is explained anthropomorphically, the term 'Nephesh' is applied to God, but only in a secondary and descriptive usage, as in Is. 42.1; cf. Jer. 51.14; Amos 6.8. We can legitimately speak of man as 'Ruach' when thinking of him theologically, religiously or ideally.

/'Ruach'

Notes:- Mystery of
Existence

2. (contd.)

'Ruach' is often interchangeable with 'Nephesh'. By the time of Ezekiel we find that 'Ruach' has come to denote the normal breath-soul as the principle of life in man, (Ezek. 37 vv. 5, 6, 8), which is directly derived from the wind at the bidding of God. (Cf. Is. 42.5; Zech. 12.1; Job 27.1; Ps. 104.29; Eccles. 27.7) From Ecclesiastes onwards we find that 'Ruach' is following a line of development somewhat similar to that of 'Nephesh' with which it may occur in parallelism. (Cf. Is. 29.6 - post exilic.) H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Christian Doctrine of Man", p.20, and also in reference to the term Ruach used as interchangeable for Nephesh, (both are in this instance equivalent to what we mean by the 'soul of man',) "Its chief importance for the doctrine of man lies, however, in the higher association of the term with the Spirit of God. The similarity of terminology kept the heavenward, so to speak, open in human nature, and not more striking case could be found of the influence of language on the thought it shapes, even while it serves." (Ibid. p.27)

George Knight's attempt to describe the extension of the personality of God by means of the 'extension' of the Nephesh of him who possesses it, is very suggestive, but much less convincing than the argument put forward by A. Johnson in his work, "The One and Many in the Israelite Conception of God", where he explicitly says, "Such examples must be understood in terms of the 'Spirit' as an extension of Yahweh's personality. Thus, in such cases as those in which the 'Ruach' of Yahweh is said to have 'donned' Gideon, like a garment, or to have 'rushed' upon Samson or upon Saul, it may hardly be said to have been regarded as an impersonal force", p.19. I should like to add to this, that it is the Ruach-quas-Ruach of God, that is all inclusive and capable of extension, and the Nephesh does not do this by itself, but by virtue of the Divine Ruach which dwells in it. By itself 'Nephesh' is non-existent, as human livingness or soul. 'Ruach', however, exists without 'Nephesh', but 'Nephesh' does not exist without 'Ruach', for the latter is a category par excellence, which denotes absolute divine livingness.

There is a modern tendency to interpret 'Ruach' and 'Nephesh' as synonymous. J. Abelson in his book, "The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature", p.192, quotes both as 'having general meaning of 'Lena'.

2. (contd.2)

kraft' or 'Lebensgeist', e.g. vitality, the life principle of created beings generally". I think that the comment of W. Robinson, "The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament", p.82 is relevant. He ascribes this identification to a lack of study of the history of usage and he argues that 'ruach' denotes essentially "those more exceptional and unusual endowments of human nature, which suggest God as their immediate source, the more normal 'nephesh' being taken for granted".

See also A. Lewis Humphries, "The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience", p.4. "What a critical examination therefore of the Old Testament brings to light, is, that the word Nephesh or 'soul', which is freely applied to man, is never associated with God. The Hebrew writers never refer to God as having a 'soul' though it seemed natural to them that he should have a spirit."

Norman H. Snaith clarifies the confusion which arises from the ruach-nephesh identification. "The later use of ruach as the Spirit of the Living Being, makes the word practically a synonym of nephesh, the breath-soul. God forms the ruach in man, (Zech.22.1.); preserves it, (Job 10.12); and it returns to Him at death. (Eccles. 12.7) In Isaiah 36.9, ruach is exactly parallel with nephesh, and so also in Job 7.11. There are some twenty cases altogether where ruach is equivalent with nephesh, but to make nephesh on that account the general equivalent of ruach is to show a complete misunderstanding of the proper significance of both word. Such an equation is wrong and can lead to nothing but error and confusion," *ibid.* 82.

3. Cf. Zech. 12.1. A.B. Davidson, in his book, "The Theology of the Old Testament," p.120, qualifies the meaning of this idea as "that universal power within all things which throws up all configurations on the face of the world, of history and of man's life, is God. When general language is used, these phenomena are said to be due to God; when more precise language is used, they are said to be due to the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God, *ab intra*, is God exerting power, God efficient, who is actually exerting efficiency in any sphere, and His efficiency pervades all spheres, the physical and moral alike."

4. Here I have used A.B. Davidson's rendering of the

4. (contd)

Hebrew Text. (Ibid. p. 121)

5. See S.A. Cook, "The Old Testament: A Re-interpretation", p. 139, the comment on Is. 31.3. This liberated the religion of Israel from magic and this differentiated it from the religions of other peoples, which were never free from magic. "The force that overthrew magic was the conviction that God was a Personal Being who stood in a personal relation to every individual Israelite, inasmuch as the latter was party to the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. Where this conviction was weakened by sin, which was a failure to keep the Law of the Covenant, the way was opened for the return to magic: indeed it may be said that magic and religion varied in inverse proportions." "Prophecy and Divination", p.241. This saved Hebrew religion from degenerating into magic, as happened with that of other races.

6. This is not excessive idealisation, even allowing that the Hebrew religion had some nature worship. The vision of the transcendent God is the core of Old Testament religion and decisive in forming the whole outlook of Ancient Israel.

7. I find it difficult to accept the view of A.B. Davidson when he says, "The sphere of the Old Testament is the practical religious sphere out of which it never wanders into the sphere of ontology. The whole question is the question of the relation of a living, active, moral personal God to the world of man. It asks as little what the essence of God is, as it asks what the essence of man is." Ibid. p. 115. Ontology is implied in the religious outlook of the Hebrew. Every kind of reflective thinking implies ontology and religious thinking especially is impossible without it. If Davidson is right, it is difficult to explain the rise of Hebrew religion without using ontology. It is impossible to postulate a transcendent God as the originator of all life without having an interest in the ontology of being.

8. The term 'Ruach' rendered in English as 'wind' or 'breath' seems primarily to have been used to denote the presence of life in man and nature. Scholars agree that 'breath' denotes the principle of life in man. (v. A. Lewis Humphries, ibid. p.3) But the meaning of the term is more extensive than

/that

8. (contd.)

that, for it stands essentially for the principle of life in general, and it was later as A. B. Davidson puts it, that 'this merely phenomenal life or visible sign, or principle, was, so to speak, intensified into an immaterial element in man, the spirit of man.' (Ibid. p.118) This judgment seems to be a logical inference for the Israelite Bedouin who saw the wind with the lightning and the storm bring rain to revive the scorched pastures; to him nature was alive, and so, when he pondered over it, he saw in the ruach-wind the energising power of nature, and his religious intuition led him to see that this mysterious living power had its cause in God who was manifested at work by the ruach. (breath, wind).

THE RUACH OF GOD IS THE SOURCE OF MORAL ORDER WHICH IS

THE GIFT QUA NON OF HUMAN EXISTENCE

Here, at the beginning, I should like to express my disagreement with A. Lewis Humphries when he says:-

"The most surprising fact in the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit, is the almost complete absence of any reference to him as the source of piety and moral excellence. Indeed, to those who come to the Old Testament with presuppositions derived from the New, it is startling to read of 'an evil spirit from the Lord' etc." (1)

The theocentricity of the Hebrew religious outlook inevitably brought about an awareness that man must measure himself against his creator. This personal and spiritual conception of God resulted in the realization that man was individually responsible to his Maker. (In this we ought to see the birth of the now widely used term 'personality'). But this 'measuring against' God, brought Old Testament man to the brink of an abyss, and the abyss was inside himself. Ideally his nature should have expressed qualities of being which were in some measure a 'copy' of his creator. (2) In fact, however, he found himself tossed about by the flux of existence beyond his power to control, and he felt himself helplessly at its mercy. This failure to govern his own life appeared to him as a personal offence against God. (3)

This drama is the theme of the Old Testament. But it is not a drama which is left unresolved - the Old Testament attempts to determine the remedy. (4) One may state it in this way - God is not only the source of created things, He is also the source which determines their nature in qualitative terms, i.e. moral evaluation. Through creation God reveals His purpose, a purpose which, for man, means an order up to which he must live, and is seen by man as the norm of existence of the whole creation. The power which called existence into being, viz., the Spirit of God, also determined this order - its moral character. As the creative source, the Spirit acts ~~was given~~ externally, one might almost say arbitrarily. As the moral source, the norm, the upholder of man, as that which gives meaning to creation, the Spirit must be asked for, desired and appropriated inwardly.

It is not imposed on man but is put at his disposal. The writer of Psalm 51 expressed the whole matter most searchingly in his prayer:-

" Create in me a clean heart, O God,
and put a new and right spirit
within me.
Cast me not away from thy presence,
and take not thy Holy Spirit
from me.
Restore to me the joy of thy
salvation,
and uphold me with a willing
spirit. "

vv.10-12.

In this quotation we notice that special pleading is made for the Holy Spirit. (5) This is not incidental for the whole problem of moral order springs from that deep awareness of the holiness of God, who demands to be imitated - "Be holy, for I am holy." Lev. 11.44 (cf. Lev.11.45; 19.2; 20.7; 20.26; Deut.14.2; 26.19; 28.9; Ps.22.3; 99.3,5; Is.6.3; 57.15)

Old Testament scholars are somewhat unwilling to consider holiness as the ground for morality in the Old Testament, maintaining that holiness does not carry with it the necessary concept of morality. Cf. Ez.42.14. (6) Yet both holiness in the Old Testament, and morality in our sense of the word, have their roots in the same experience of the human spirit. Man recognised the perfection of God and contrasted this with his own imperfection and was aware that the gulf which separated him from God should be bridged and wished that the flux of time which makes human life so fleeting, could be arrested, so that he might address his maker and answer His demand. In other words, this underlying experience contains what religiously may be called the need for redemption. This comes from the experience of 'otherness' which exists between God and man. Such a religious attitude was only possible where God is recognised as fully personal, as He was by Israel. (7) Here arises the principle of discrimination in which the whole moral order has its ground. Old Testament man worked out the implications of ~~this~~ separation, not in abstract metaphysical principles, but in the tangible circumstances of every day life, in order that he might overcome it. We learn that holiness, when approached 'unlawfully' was dangerous, but when appropriated

/lawfully

lawfully through ceremonial law, it became a cleansing power which made man fit to stand in the Holy of Holies, even as the High Priest did.

Admittedly, the use of 'holiness' as a scrutinising principle meant that discrimination was made between external things by a value judgment placed on things 'clean' and 'unclean', but, at the same time, there is a direct relation between this idea and the morality principle, with its discrimination by value judgments on internal thoughts and actions. Having reached the morality principle as a deeper understanding of the nature of the experience under discussion, we must still retain the principle of 'holiness'. It is only by taking both principles together, that we can do full justice to the experience of man before his God. Moral judgments are conditioned by the external circumstances under which a man lives. Our moral judgment, therefore, must discriminate among external things also, not as being good and evil in themselves, but because different things condition differently our actions. This external discrimination must be taken seriously, for we are not embodied spirits, but animated bodies and our inner selves cannot escape the impact of the external. N. Snaith has rightly refused to consider separating the two principles in the Old Testament. Both principles bear, for him, a direct relationship to each other, and are, in fact, inseparable from each other. (8) The Spirit, who eminently belonged to God, and fully partook of the holiness of God, bridged the gulf between God and man; so much so, that, when man rebels against God wilfully, the Spirit is grieved. Isaiah express this most vividly -

"But they rebelled
and grieved his holy spirit."

Is. 63.10 (9)

(This ought to be compared with Rom. 8.26 and Eph. 4.30) Because he had found that the Spirit of God was the source of this reconciliation which brings about moral excellence, the writer of the 143rd Psalm calls the Spirit of God 'the good spirit'.

"Teach me to do thy will,
for thou art my God!
Let thy good spirit lead me
on a level path!"

v.10

In Nehemiah 9, the writer re-calls the offence of the Israelites in making the golden calf, and, after numbering the mercies of God granted in spite of

/their

their failure, says, "Thou gavest thy Good Spirit to instruct them". (v.20) The meaning of 'instruct' here is no doubt that of how to do right things in the sight of God, or in other words, the awakening of their moral consciousness, to use more modern terminology. In the 59th chapter of Isaiah, the Covenant of the redeemed community, in which man will express moral uprightness, will come to pass because "My spirit, which is upon you, and my words which I have put into your mouth, shall not depart out of your mouth, or out of the mouth of your children. (v.21) Compare Ezekiel 36.27 - "I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances." In Isaiah 32.14, the desolation announced by the prophet, occasioned by failing to live righteously before God, will not disappear until righteousness is re-established, and this will come about, the prophet says, when "the spirit is poured upon us from on high." (v.15)

The idea we have been examining here, is implicit throughout the Old Testament in varying terminology. Sometimes the idea is expressed in terms of the morally compelling character of the presence of God, (12) and the whole idea of Law in the Old Testament springs from the religious experience of the Ruach of God who alone was able to work a moral regeneration of erring man. The Law was an attempt to 'objectivise', (10) to arrest the Holy Ruach of God and have it portrayed in written form to serve as a guiding principle to regulate man's moral unrest. (11) Indeed it is only from this standpoint that we may understand the attitude of devotion of the Old Testament towards the Law in such instances as Psalms 119 and Zechariah 7.12.

So the whole problem of morality may be summed up in the words of Aubrey Johnson when he says, "... and while the study of the Old Testament reveals that it was often a matter of dispute as to how Yahweh's will was to be defined, the ideal for the devout Israelite was that his own Ruach should be in accord with that of Yahweh" (12).

This chapter would be incomplete ~~would be incomplete~~ without reference to the contradictory view that God is not only the source of moral excellence, but also the source of evil, since from him, according to many Old Testament passages, proceeds an 'evil spirit'. (13)¹³ This essay must attempt to give a theological explanation of this duality, for, taken at its face value, it plays havoc with the sublime conception of the God to whom the Israelites witnessed, and whom the Prophets declared to be righteous. (14)

Before we deal with this problem, mention must be made of the fact that both Christianity and Judaism alike repudiate the idea that God is the source of evil, in spite of the fact that both claim direct religious descent from the religion of the Old Testament in which this duality is seemingly implied. The Christian assertion that God is the source only of good and not of evil, may be summed up in the words of the writer of the 1st Epistle of St. John. "This is the message we have heard from him and proclaim to you, that God is light and in him is no darkness at all." (1.5.) Light and darkness obviously have reference to good and evil. The Jewish view is expressed by the contributor to the Jewish Encyclopedia in Philo's words - "De Profugis", §15. "He (God) is free from evil and therefore cannot be its source." (15)

How, therefore, can this dichotomy in God as the source of good and evil according to the Old Testament be understood? Here is offered a theological explanation using the category of Ruach. It is in this term that the problem in fact lies, for the evil that comes from God is spoken of as 'an evil spirit' whose origin is God. The whole problem is linked up with the notion of the justice of God in relation to the world and man. Man had to express his sense of this justice. Its impact upon him he experienced as an outpouring of Ruach which prompted him to action. But actions, seemingly similarly prompted, led to different results - sometimes moral and religious fulfilment, sometimes moral failure and frustration. These diverse fruits led to the attribution to God of a dual character. Man's experience of the Ruach of God had a dual character, so that duality must belong to God's nature. What the Old Testament thinker did not perceive, was that what the Ruach revealed to man, was himself in relation to God, not as a mere toy in his hands, but as a being who was given freedom, which, just because it was God-given, was meant to be in accordance with God's will. When this freedom was turned to serve other purposes than God's, then God's spirit was revealed as 'evil', because man had used it to accomplish, not God's will, but his own. In other words, he has demonised it, proclaiming himself the sovereign and not God. (He may still do this verbally, but he has failed to do it existentially.) "An evil spirit from the Lord" is, in fact, man's interpretation - or rather his excuse. (16)

In the same way we ought to understand the attribution to God of such feelings as wrath, fury and the like. When Old Testament man described either the evil spirit from God, or His fury or wrath, he found in them a haunting experience - an indication that he was separated from God. This separation he interpreted as the divine punishment imposed arbitrarily by God, whose nature expressed equally both good and evil. Man has renounced his relationship with God on God's terms, and since the break in this relationship cuts man off from the spirit of God, which is the source of his moral fulfillment, the absence of it in man is naturally felt as 'an evil spirit'. But evil as such is thus negative, the absence of God, and God cannot be the source of the absence of Himself. So the use of the idea of the evil spirit from the Lord, is a theological explanation of an anthropological phenomenon based on the mistaken assumption that evil, like good, is ontologically real, and that God is at the same time "a ov" and "ov". This only shows that those who value the practical and the immanent without examining them in relation to the speculative and the transcendent, cannot find the truth about the nature of reality. On the level of pure immanence, the reality is dichotomous. The source of things is not in themselves, but in God, and God, though he embraces them all, also transcends them and their dichotomy.

Thus in the Old Testament, we have found that God 'in Himself' is good and holy; that mercy and loving-kindness are expressions of His very self, but, because of His sovereign rule over the world and man, He is a source of evil as a punishment of the failure of created things to obey His laws.

But the source of this evil and punishment is in reality in man's use of his freedom: when used for selfish human ends it becomes demonic. Over-emphasis on theocentricity in the Old Testament precluded Old Testament man from seeing man fully, wholly and so he attributed his evil to God. (Some forms of Christian theology are not free from a similar fault.)

That God has a single purpose and a nature solely good, is implied in a deeper understanding of Him in the Old Testament record of His dealings with the world and the history of man.

Notes: The Ruach of
God, the Source
of Moral Order.

1. "The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience", pp. 11 & 12.
2. In an unpublished lecture, Lev. Gillet, the author of "Communion in Messiah", argued that the translation into English of the Hebrew terms 'Zaloni' and 'Damut', was 'the image', that is the image of God. These expressed the idea of 'shaping' or 'giving expression to'; when used with 'the image of God', they meant to stress that man was morally capable of expressing, relatively of course since he is a creature, qualities such as holiness, goodness and the like which belong par excellence to God.
3. This is most realistically represented in Ps. 51.
4. "Human nature gained a new significance as the creation of Yahweh, whose hands had shaped its prototype, and whose breath had given the body its vitality. The moral consciousness of man, which was in the process of evolution through his social relationships in the family, the local group and the nation, attained a new value and a characteristic interpretation as the moral law of Yahweh. The very effort to obey his law and to promote obedience to it, on the part of others, threw man back on the thought of the Ruach of Yahweh, the potent influence from without which could create new conditions within human nature. The common feature, in these diverse applications of the new doctrine of God, is insistence on man's dependence on Him". R. Wheeler Robinson: "The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament", p.84.
5. A. L. Humphries quotes from Welhausen that 'the Spirit of the Lord is restricted to the operative presence of God Himself and the Spirit partakes, therefore, of the holy character of God'. Ibid. 13
6. Vide O.C. Whitehouse's contribution in "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics" on "Holiness", (Semitic). Referring to the concept of holiness in Leviticus, he says, "Holiness is treated in every respect as somewhat material", Vol. 6, p.752. Vide also N. Snaith's chapter on holiness, ibid. 21 ff., and A.B. Davidson, ibid. p. 145 - "In its original use the term 'holy' when applied either to God or to man does not express moral quality."
7. This is pointed out by Skinner in "Hastings

7. (contd)

Dictionary of the Bible", on 'holiness', p.394, Vol. II; v. also 'Contagion of Holiness' in "Encyclopedia Biblica", Vol. I, 838.

8. "We are dealing with embryo notions of qodesh and equally with embryo notions of ethics. We maintain that the embryo qodesh, (holiness), involves an embryo-ethical content and embryo ideas of sin. If sin did not exist in the proper sense of the word, then neither did qodesh, and we have as little rights or as much right, to talk about one as about the other - ... The word qodesh originally had no moral content in our developed sense of the word 'moral' but it did involve pre-ethical restrictions as undeveloped in content as itself." *ibid.* 32.

For Ezekiel the actions of external cleansing were directly related to the practice of divine precepts. (Ezek.36.25ff) External holiness is the work of God alone. He puts the new spirit in man, that he, through God's holiness, may act morally.

9. This quotation, and also would Mic.3.8, would contradict A.L. Humphries statement quoted at the beginning of this section.

10. The term 'objectivise' is borrowed from N. Berdyaev's philosophy to describe man's rationalisation of an inner experience. This carries the danger of misinterpretation of the original experience.

11. It is only when explained in this way that we can understand the writer of Deut.30.11ff. "For this commandment ... is not in heaven ... but it is in your mouth and your heart, so that you can do it."

12. "The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel", p.38.

13. Judges 9.23; I Sam. 16 vv.14 & 16; I Kings 22, 23; I Sam. 18.10; called even 'an evil spirit of God', LXX I Sam.19.9.

14. "This means that there is a standard to which He is expected to conform (Zedek) just as there are standard weights and measures to which the tradesman ought to conform". H. Wheeler Robinson: "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament", p. 253. If

Notes: The Ruach of God the Source
of Moral Order.

this be so, then it is difficult to accept the idea that He is both the source of good and evil.

15. Jewish Encyclopaedia: "God", Vol. VI p.5.

16. Vide op.cit. A. Guillaume p.145 ff. esp. 146, p.155 in connection with Ez. 14.9 and also p.269 ff; vide Chapter on Ecstasy, esp. p. 325, the last paragraph.

HISTORY AS THE STAGE OF GOD'S ACTION

It seems appropriate to open this chapter by a quotation from H. Wheeler Robinson. "The revelation of the Old Testament is not philological, but historical; the more term is a locked drawer till we have opened it with the key of history." (1)

The history of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures will never cease to inspire the religious mind of any generation in its search for the Divine. It will always remain a sheer impossibility for man's spirit to grasp the Spirit of God in any intelligible way, unless he perceives God working through concrete historic events, which can be grasped and contemplated. The Israelites were the first to perceive the working of God in history, and, by an analysis of historic events, to read in them the meaning which the Spirit of Jehovah had imprinted on them. Piecing these events together, they discovered the pattern and the purpose of the Spirit of God. Thus they have been able to present us with a most remarkable "history of the manifestation of God's purpose" which may well be the theme of future historians, as scientific history is the theme of historians of our day. (2-)

/in history

In trying to explain the manifestation of God/ Heilige Geschichte, as it is usually called, in its development through the Old Testament, the category of the Ruach of God is indispensable. Let me first emphasize that, in the minds of those who wrote the Old Testament, history is not as with us, a record of human doings, but is a record of God's doings. The outlook of the Heilige Geschichte in both Old and New Testaments may be expressed in the dictum to man, in St. Paul's words - "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure". (Phils.2.12,13)

But in the Old Testament, as in the New, the working of God in history is not mechanical but spiritual, (3) which amounts to saying that God has given freedom to man, and therefore His working in history is dependent on man's response to the freedom he has been given. And so "God's History" becomes essentially man's history - a divine-human synergism. In the Old Testament this synergism is and must be untransfigured tragedy, for man does not understand the nature of his freedom, and therefore does not use it rightly, and so he cannot understand or fully co-operate with his creator. Thus, since history

/must

must be 'redeemed', enlightened by Him who is its author, and this light must shine and illumine history with human beings freely expressing the will of God, we have in the Old Testament a record of the Spirit of God making attempts through various channels to manifest Himself in history, and illumine history from within. What follows will be an attempt to show how the religious writers of the Old Testament expected this "Incarnation of the Spirit of God" to come; or, to express it more philosophically, in what way the absolute and eternal was expected to invade the relative and temporal.

It is important to notice that God in the Old Testament is a personal self, who desires to communicate His own self to the world of history. The Old Testament speaks of the Spirit as the agent by whom God's communicability is realized; the Spirit of God has no permanent resting-place in history, because the Spirit has been given only partial resting place on earth. The whole situation may be described thus - God has created history and is its *raison d'être* and history must be understood by man for whose sake it exists through God's revelation of Himself in it. The Spirit of God, in His pleading with man to let Him abide in history, says, as it were, "You can do nothing unless I be your light; you must give me an abiding place worthy of my holiness." This is dramatically described in the Old Testament as the striving of the Spirit of God against the spirit of man. The tragedy of the divine human encounter as portrayed in the Old Testament is precisely the inability of man to pray constantly to the Spirit of God, "Come and abide among us"; (4) for, so long as the Spirit of God remains outside the historic order, and is not incarnate in it permanently, man is bound to live in darkness.

Yet man, not completely unresponsive to the promptings of the Spirit, has himself contemplated various human instruments - "the tabernacles of God" - to make the Spirit rest. The Old Testament has bequeathed to us a coherent picture of the hopes and disappointments for 'bringing God down' by letting His Spirit manifest His will. We see through the Old Testament records, how, one after another, different ideas were taken up, and then, when their insufficiencies were discovered, rejected since they were incomplete, and often wrong ways, to prepare the way for the Spirit to abide in history. (vide Is. 40.13ff) We shall consider the relevance of this with regard to the view that the Spirit's striving to enter into hist-

ory, is a fulfilment of human striving to stand before God with unveiled face.

The first great idea we must consider is that which is never lost sight of in the Old Testament, and has persisted even to our own day among the Jews, namely, that in the Mosaic Community, the People of God, the Spirit is revealed. Their experience in the wilderness, under the leadership of Moses, created an awakened consciousness among the Israelites, that they were a people of a special destiny because of their particular standing before Yahweh. It is perhaps impossible to say that the experience of the giving of the Law at Sinai, together with preceding and succeeding mighty deeds of God, was thought out theologically by the Israelites who experienced them. They at any rate realised that Yahweh was showing special favour to them, and that they were the people of God's choice. (5) They recognised also that they therefore had a purpose to accomplish under His will. But when later generations looked back upon the purpose of God in the events which Exodus chiefly describes, they saw clearly that here God's spirit was acting on the whole nation, making it His instrument, 'an abode and resting place' by means of which He might manifest Himself to the world. The idea is made explicit in the prophet's words about the Holy Spirit being in the midst of the Mosaic Community: Is. 63.11,14. (cf. Neh.9.20)

"Then he remembered the days of old,
of Moses his servant. ...

Where is he who put in the midst of
them

his holy Spirit." Is.63.11 (6)

"Like cattle that go down into the valley,
the Spirit of the Lord gave them rest. So thou didst
lead thy people, to make for thyself a glorious name."
So the Mosaic Community is described as Spirit created
and Spirit bearing. (7) In this lies its greatness
but thus also comes its failure.

The Spirit, in giving itself to the Covenant
people, made possible, if they had turned in self-
giving to Yahweh, the revelation of His purpose in
history, through the shaping of their destiny as a
community. But, after the wilderness period, when
the Israelites entered Canaan and came under the
influence of the less spiritually exalted of their
neighbours, the compromise which they then made with
the various nature cults, made it impossible for Is-
rael to regard herself as the resting place of the

Spirit of God. Israel as a community had failed to be what Yahweh meant her to be: she knew she was no more His people and the instrument of His Spirit.(8)

Yet the idea of God's spirit manifesting Himself in history was not given up. The community had failed but there were other means by which the light of the Spirit could be made to shine upon the world, other ways in which witness could be borne to the fact that this is God's world. Men may fail to witness to the Spirit communally, but it was still possible for small groups of people, or for individuals, to be the channels of the Spirit. There was still a way by which the Spirit, the giver of life and the meaning of life, could shine out as the fulness of life, the fulness of the Glory of God.

This brings us to the second way in which the Old Testament writers conceived of the Spirit of God finding a resting-place in history, namely in individuals, - in hero, priest, prophet, king. After the failure of Israel as a Community to make the Spirit 'rest' in history, the relationship between God and man does not cease. As the community, because of its apostasy, ceased to be the guardian of the Revelation, so individuals, who had previously partaken of the favour of God only through the mediation of the community, felt called upon to be witnesses to God instead of to the community, and instruments of the Spirit of God in His communication of Himself in history. This had very significant consequences: the community had to look to the individual, instead of vice-versa, for the guidance of the Spirit.

But the assertion of the individual as the favourite of God, made the community, perhaps subconsciously, realise its failure to be the instrument of God, God's holy people. Being unable to re-assert itself as the bearer of the Spirit of God, the community showed its failure negatively by its hostility to those individuals, whether hero, prophet, priest or king, who took upon themselves the responsibility of being the instruments of the Spirit. (9) An individual called to this task came into conflict not only with the community, but also with other individuals who similarly put forward the claim of being spokesmen of the divine Spirit. (10) In spite of this, individuals continued to assert themselves, and henceforth the manifestation of the Spirit is connected with individuals of His choice.

Yet these individuals, as instruments of the

/Spirit

Spirit, are important not as isolated beings, but always in their relationship to the community, and moreover to history as a whole: (11) their message, when taken out of its historical context, becomes unintelligible. This is as it should be. They did not speak essentially of themselves, (12) but of God and God's spirit in utterance and action. Because God is Absolute, His actions carry with themselves far-reaching consequences, and can only be understood be understood when every individual action is interpreted in relation to all His actions; and His action as a whole can only be understood in relation to His purpose of manifesting Himself in history absolutely, by resting His Spirit in it. In other words, we must see history as the manifestation in the individual and community together, of the Spirit of God, until such time as history is gathered into supra-history, or, in the words of the New Testament, until worldly kingdoms become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ. (But this is to anticipate.)

We now return to examine some examples of where the Spirit of God made his claim upon history by manifesting Himself through particular individuals. We start with some striking examples - those of the heroes, or, as they are called in the Old Testament Scriptures, the Judges. The most remarkable instance is that of Gideon in Judges 6.34 - "But the Spirit of the Lord took possession of Gideon." The Hebrew word used is 'Labash' - 'to clothe oneself' - a most vivid description of an individual being used as the instrument of the Spirit to accomplish God's will in a particular situation. The reference made to Othniel in Judges 3.10 shows that through him the Spirit controlled a historic situation by making him a judge - "The Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he judged Israel". The action of Jephthah is imputed to the Spirit of the Lord coming on him, (Judges 11.29) and on Samson. (Judges 13.25; 14.6) The mission of Saul, it is predicted by Samuel, is to be warranted by the coming of the Spirit upon him. (I Sam. 10.10 and fulfilled in I Sam. 11.6). (13) David is set apart to serve, that it must be taken as it stands in I Sam. 16.13 - "Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brothers; and the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward."

When man plans to frustrate the commission of those whom the Spirit has chosen, the Spirit acts in such a way that His will and not that of the adversary is served. The classic instance of this is

the conflict between Saul, who had been discarded by the Spirit as an instrument, (I Sam. 16.17), and David who had been chosen by the Spirit in his stead. The messengers whom Saul sends against David are gripped by the Spirit and are changed from enemies to supporters of David. (Sam. 19.20; 21) Saul himself suffers a like fate, giving rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (I Sam. 19.23, 27; cf. 12.18)

The song of David contained in the last two chapters of the Second Book of Samuel is in many respects uniquely illustrative of our theme. When David gives utterance to his meditation, upon what God has done for him as king, he is putting forward a philosophy or theology of an individual's history, which is born of a real personal experience. Here we have one who recognises himself as a man of destiny, and knows his destiny is through his kingship to establish and inaugurate God's design. David expresses this trenchantly. "The spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my tongue. The God of Israel has spoken." (II Sam. 23.2, 3) But the whole poem is revealing, and, if read with this quotation as a key, will illustrate most fully what we have said about the divine-human synergism of the Old Testament where the individual is the agent of the Spirit in his revelation or 'incarnation' in history.

The full significance of God's purpose for history is not grasped till we come to the prophets. It was the prophet who first challenged the conception that God was far away and had nothing to do with history. God's immanence the prophets explained as the Spirit of God dwelling in them, not because of their virtue, and impelling them to speak their prophetic message. (14) (Amos 7.14ff) The prophet Micah describes his prophetic claim expressly: "I am filled with power, with the Spirit of the Lord, and with justice and might to declare to Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin." (Mic. 3.8) This idea is expressed most specifically by Second Isaiah in Is. 49.16: "And now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit." (15) A similar idea is contained in Isaiah 61.1 where the prophet declares his mission in the words, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me because the Lord has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted . . ."

As far as the problem of history is concerned, the issue for a prophetic consciousness is now clear: it is the lack of individual response to the Spirit of God which confuses and darkens the scene of history. The redactor of the Book of the Law projects into the

one of the most profound experiences of his time when he ascribes to Moses the words, "Would that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (Num. 11.29)

It is only in the context of this awareness which the prophets possessed, that the meaning and significance of the prophets may be understood. It was a right judgment of the Christian Fathers at the 2nd Oecumenical Council when they associated the Prophets with the Spirit as interpreters of one another. (16) But so far as textual reference goes, it is striking that the classical prophets, especially Isaiah and Jeremiah, do not interpret their prophetic mission in the terms we have laid down above - they do not seek the principle of prophecy in the activity of the Spirit of God. H.W. Robinson in his book, "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament" interprets this as due to the misuse of the conception by more primitive types of prophecy. (17)

In Isaiah 11.2, however, the Age of the Messianic King is conceived as a time when the Spirit of the Lord is resting upon the Messianic King. It is a loss that the prophet, who was so deeply conscious that he was foretelling the Kingdom of the Messiah, did not more explicitly claim for himself that Spirit which was in the process of inaugurating the Kingdom through him; for the utterance of the prophet cannot be separated from his personal experience of that of which he prophesies. Even if the prophetic picture the prophet draws bears no relationship to the immediate historic situation in which he finds himself, by his understanding of the reality which lies behind all mere happenings, he himself participates in the reality of what he foretells. (It is through seeing this separation of the prophetic vision from historic reality that scholars have preferred 'forth-telling' to 'fore-telling' as a description of the prophetic task. But they forget that forth-telling is by its nature fore-telling, because the vision, as an experience of the reality which underlies the flux of events, may actualise itself in history. (19) The actualisation may differ from the picture the prophet has drawn, and yet it will be recognised as the historic fulfilment of his prophecy by those historical witnesses possessed of basically the same religious attitudes as the prophet. (18)

As for the prophet Jeremiah, he, more than anybody was aware that, in his person, the Divine Being

had wrought a manifestation of His purpose on the historic scene, so much so, that he describes God as saying, "If you utter what is precious and not what is worthless, you shall be as my mouth". (Jer. 15.19) One gains further insight into this thought from the way Jeremiah sees the relationship between himself and the Great New Covenant. (Jer. 31.31) (20) As he describes, with a deep and intimate awareness, what has been disclosed to him of the mercy of God, he shows how that mercy and that intimacy, the inter-relation of the Divine and human, must one day be painted large on the canvas of history as they now are in miniature in his heart. Then "no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more". (31.34)

Surely we are here in the familiar atmosphere which implies the entering of the Spirit into history, the claim of God upon history expressed through the prophet. Jeremiah was singularly aware that in his person and his office, God had been manifesting a purpose for history which transcended any particular individual or nation. This explained the feeling of unworthiness the prophet had for both himself and the nation which he denounced and also his bold self-assertion. Here, he felt, he was defending a divine claim, which, as it were, depended on him to assert itself in history. If we did not possess a Category of the Spirit of God in connection with history and prophetic consciousness, it would be a theological necessity to postulate it here in order to explain the divine impact on history as felt by Jeremiah, and yet at the same time to ensure that that impact remained dependent on the free response of the human will without the co-operation of which, God's purpose for history would remain unaccomplished. (21)

Although Isaiah, Amos and Jeremiah without making mention of "the Spirit of God" prefer to attribute their experience to God, it would be bad theology not to recognise that the whole idea of the Spirit as expounded in this chapter was undoubtedly present in the minds of these prophets, though absent from their vocabulary. Their conception of the Spirit integrates their prophetic activity with previous religious history and with the idea of prophecy as later developed.

Ezekiel interprets his prophetic experiences quite explicitly as the work of the Spirit of God. (22-a

According to Ezekiel the Spirit uses the prophet to (b) explain himself in history, and justifies the prophet to history as the one who asserts the claim of God's spirit. He shows that only when the Spirit rests in history does history cease to be futile; only when historic events are seen in the light of the Spirit of God are their nature and meaning clear. (c)

But, however much the individual had been instrumental in keeping man aspiring heavenwards, and in expressing the striving of the Divine to dwell in history so that men might behold his glory, the mediation of the individual was eventually proved incapable of arresting the Spirit of God. We witness that failure in the extinction of prophecy. (d) Even while prophecy flourished some of the best religious minds came into conflict with it because self-seeking was intermingled with the divine claim which was put forward. (e)

This was what led the prophet Isaiah to look for the New Individual as the more authentic instrument of the Spirit who would arrest the Spirit, and bring Him to abide completely in history, and not partially as did the historic prophets. Hence we have the prophecy of the Messianic King in the 11th Chapter of Isaiah, (f) and also the conception of the Suffering Servant. (g)

At the same time as the prophetic mind was looking towards the more complete individual as the vehicle of the spirit, so there was also a development of the idea of the more perfect community as the vehicle of God's Spirit. There was a feeling that through the community Divine and human unity was expressed more completely. The idea of the Remnant, the Redeemed Community, as the bearer of the Spirit, found its spokesmen in the prophets. (See especially Ezekiel, "I will give them one heart, and put a new spirit within them"), (Ezek. 11.19; cf. Ezek. 36.26) and "I will not hide my face any more from them, when I pour out my spirit upon the house of Israel, says the Lord God", (Ezek. 39.29; cf. Is. 44.3) The prophet Haggai dwells on this theme and addresses himself to the Jewish community under Zerubbabel, "I am with you, says the Lord of Hosts, according to the promise that I made you when you came out of Egypt. My spirit abides among you; fear not," (Hag. 2.4,5) Thus he revived the idea of the community as the bearer of the spirit. Regardless of the fact that the Mosaic community had failed, Haggai reasons that God's promise stands, and, given a communal acceptance, the Spirit of God would not refuse to make the community His abode; the community could make His rest by making God its chief, its centre

of inspiration. (23)

The well-known prophecy of Joel, (2.28,29), "I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" is a contemplation of the same theme. The Old Testament mind perceived that, however beneficial was the effect of prophecy, and the Spirit of God resting upon a few individuals who manifested a divine claim to history, these were not adequate to express the universality of the Spirit and created a conflict which was a hindrance to the fuller revelation of the Spirit of God, between the individual and the community. The solution of the problem, as we see it in Joel, was the idea of the prophetic community, where the community would be endowed with the Spirit. Thus the individual prophetic consciousness would not oppose the community and suffer for its witness, but would find complete fulfilment through the community. As the Divine Spirit poured forth, making harmony within the human situation, It would bring the individual and the community into a perfect divine-human relationship, the reigning of the Spirit. (24)

But the ideas of the Messianic King, the Suffering Servant, and the Remnant or the prophetic community, do not belong to the actual history of the Old Testament. These ideas belong to an age when man has grasped in a religious sense that both the individual and the community, in spite of the failure of both to bring the Spirit fully into history, must be retained and must re-assert themselves as Gods instruments through whom alone the Spirit may invade history and redeem it. It is here that the Old Testament's religious INSIGHT stops, - in despair with historic actuality, because man, individually and communally, has failed to arrest the Spirit - in hope that in spite of Man's failure God will not abandon history but that His spirit will enter fully into it. Thus the religious genius of the Hebrew counterbalanced even this despair by his faith that the last word remains with God, and therefore man and history will not be abandoned. (25)

But one thing becomes clear: the Old Testament leaves us with a kind of Anselmian dilemma so far as history is concerned. History must arrest the Spirit of God by making it rest permanently in history, and the Spirit is striving to enter history: but it is only man individually and communally who could so hold the spirit, and this is impossible. History in the O.T. remains untransfigured tragedy, God and man facing each other over the abyss of a helpless situation, both futilely craving that God be brought into history

/and

and that history be enlightened from above.. an impossibility, a futile hope, unless there was an individual who was a God-man, a community which was Divine-human in an absolute sense. (26)

sianic Community that

It is to the Coming of the Messiah and the Mes-/
the O.T. turns, and without understanding this hope we cannot understand the experience of its fulfillment in the New Testament, that experience which brought about the claim on the part of the Christian converts that the Old Testament was a book which belonged to them, because they and they alone could read it aright. The Old Testament for the fulfillments of its hopes looks for a God-man, a Divine-human society: the New Testament writers claim Jesus as the God-man, and the Church as the Divine-human society through which the Spirit rests in history. The frustration of the Old Testament with its relative and intermittent restings of the Spirit is done away. So long as history contains this Divine-human society established by the God-man - Man who has brought God down, God who has entered into history - the Spirit rests in history that He may abide therein and make it a meeting place of God and man. In this meeting may be expressed the creative purpose which God has chosen for it.

Notes: History as the Stage

1. "The Christian Doctrine of Man", p. 43 also
"Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament",
p. 189

"God Himself must for ever be beyond the reach of human comprehension the only way in which we can know Him is by His willing entrance into our human experience, that is, by some form of activity or manifestation which we can know We have kept before us three great realms in which this is brought about, namely, Nature, Man and History. Revelation always means an appeal to something drawn from one of these three, something which is both natural and supernatural, natural as product or event, supernatural in the interpretation. There must be the actual event to be the nucleus of the interpretation and of faith in the divine revelation. In this sense, therefore, God anthropomorphises Himself in order to be known by man".

2. A. Guillaume, op. cit., p.409. "It was the belief of the Hebrews that God had revealed Himself in history as their guide and protector; that by a succession of signs and wonders He had shown His care for them and His purpose"

3. By this is meant that force in its accepted sense has nothing to do with God. I think that the idea was grasped by the prophet when he said, "Then He said to me: this is the word of the Lord to Zerubabel: not by might, nor by power but by my Spirit says the Lord of hosts". Zech.4.6 . In all His workings and dealings with man God addresses man as a person and does not compel him. The words of the prophet best sums this up: "Come now, let us reason together, says the Lord." Is.1.18 Through such personal encounters God's purpose is accomplished.

4. From the prayer to the Holy Spirit in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

5. Cf. Amos 3.2; Hos. 13.4 and 5.

6. In his book, "The Mines of Isaiah Re-explored", T.K. Choyne commenting on this passage calls the Holy Spirit 'the Manwordside of the Deity.' p. 175.

7. The same idea is implied in "the Angel of His Presence", Is. 63.9 and what was later known in Rabbinic literature as 'Shekinah'. See L. Gillett in "Communion in Messiah", p.82, who identifies the cloud of the tabernacle, Ex. 40, 34-38 with the

7. (contd.)

Shekinah. G. Douglas in "Isaiah One and His Book ONE", says, (p.402), "The Angel of His presence is that glorious being, mysterious to the saints of the Old Testament, but as it seems plain enough since the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ". J. Abelson quotes Budde on the same passage: "Der Engel in dem Gottes Angesicht erscheint, in dem er in Person gegenwartig, ist also ebenfalls eine Offenbarung Gottes". And then he continues: "In other words, an angel is a revelation of the Person of God, which was a reality to the heart and mind of Israel". And this, says Budde, is similar to the Holy Spirit which Israel possessed because through Israel, God's revelation was manifest. "Israel is the nation of Revelation because it has God's Holy Spirit". *ibid.* 196

A.R. Johnson in "One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God" refers to the conception of Malak Yahweh: "Now it is commonly regarded as an extraordinary feature of the conception of the Malak Yahweh", (and therefore worthy of special comment), "that he is frequently indistinguishable from Yahweh Himself; but the reason for this is now clear. It is but another aspect of that oscillation as between the corporate unit within the conception of God, which we have been studying; and it has its parallel in the fact that in the conception of man the human MALAK or "messenger" may be similarly indistinguishable from the Adon or Lord, p.33

The foregoing is essential to the understanding of Muslim teaching on the Spirit, especially in the belief that Jesus is the Spirit of God (v. "Christ in Islam" by James Robson, especially p. 36ff., and also the illuminating study by Thomas O. Shaughnessy, S.J., ("The Development of the Meaning of the Spirit in the Koran"), in particular, A: Gabriel the Spirit, p.51, and B: Jesus the Spirit, p.57.

8. The desire of Yahweh to make Israel as a community the instrument of His spirit in spite of her disobedience, is expressed by Nehemiah, 9.30 ff.; cf. also Ps. 106, 32ff.

9. An illustration of this may be seen in I Samuel where we have two accounts of how Saul became king, one as acceptable, (9.1 to 10.10 and Ch. 11) and in the account as an impostor and usurper of Yahweh's authority who consequently denounced by Samuel who is the spokesman for the community against the indiv-

9. (contd.)

idual. (I Sam.8, 1-22; 10.17-22) In the same book we find later that though the individual (Saul) was shown hostility by the community, it nevertheless accepts another individual, (David), as a messenger from God and fully approved him as king. (I Sam.16.13)

10. We find conflict between King and prophet; for example between David and Nathan; between prophet and prophet as Micaiah and other prophets, (I Kings 22ff.); between priest and prophet as prophet Amos at Bethel and Amaziah the priest. (Amos 7.10ff).

11. "There is no revelation in general (Offenbarung-überhaupt). Revelation grasps an individual or a group, usually a group through an individual; it has only revelation of power in this correlation". Paul Tillich: "Systematic Theology I," p.111.

12. From our statements on divine-human synergism, it will be clear that the words and actions of these individuals cannot be indiscriminately assumed to be the work of the Spirit. Since we have said that God does not work co-ercively but spiritually, a critical approach is demanded of us. How far have these individual instruments of the Spirit genuinely expressed their own opinions instead of God's and His own Spirit? We must follow the workings of the Spirit in His communication at particular times and in particular circumstances, by submitting His instruments to be interpreted by Him, instead of them interpreting Him. In his book Alfred Guillaume, p. 293, states: "To maintain that in every instance divine truth was supernaturally conveyed to the prophets is to attribute to the Deity words and works which do violence to man's instructive reverence for the Divine perfection and to our conception of absolute truth and justice; while to assert that the prophets were not Ecstasies is to ignore the evidence cited in the previous lectures." p. 293 By the statement that prophets were ecstasies Guillaume means that they were in truth divinely inspired and were the mouthpieces of God.

13. Vide Guillaume, p. 300. "We may not read into this early document all that the Spirit of God came to mean for men; but we may at least assert that for the men of that generation the Spirit of Yahweh was the manifestation of God in power, a divine energy acting upon men from without and that they were not m

/were

Notes: History as the Stage

13. (contd.)

were most fully conscious of that power when they were in ecstasy" p.300

14. Vide Guillaume, p.299 and also 393: "It cannot be doubted that the prophet believed that the source of his power was the Spirit of Yahweh, of which he was the mouthpiece" ... "He uttered the Word of the Lord which brought and effected its own fulfilment".

15. Vide E.J. Kissane: "The Book of Isaiah", Vol. II, p.116. If the text is correct the speaker is the prophet, but Kissane translates 'rucho' as 'relief and deliverance'. There is no reason to accept Kissane's translation. If our argument is sound, the way in which the prophet speaks about himself is natural.

16. The failure was, of course, to confine all the revelation of the Holy Spirit to the prophecy of the Old Testament, without making any reference to the New Testament revelation which would have remained unintelligible had it not been for the par excellence revelation of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. (The weight which the Fathers have put on the prophecy as the par excellence manifestation of the Holy Spirit is chiefly due to II Peter 1.21.)

17. "Most people to-day, if asked to define 'inspiration' would probably reply, "The influence of the Spirit of God", and would expect to find this confirmed by the explicit claims of the classical prophets. Yet as far as terminology goes, this would hardly be true. Hosea uses the term 'man of the Spirit', (9.7) as equivalent to prophet. Ezekiel frequently refers to the Spirit entering him, falling upon him, lifting him up, transforming him, but we do not find such language in Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah. The explanation may well be that the term had become somewhat discredited through its long and close association with primitive types of prophecy" p.179 ff.

19. Jesus in John 8.56 is reported saying: "Abraham your father exulted in the thought that that he would see my day. And he saw it and rejoiced". (Trans. by M.V. Rieu: "The Four Gospels" Penguin Classics) To explain the prophetic utterance which came out from the experience, which had no setting in the immediate historic situation in which the prophet lived, does not mean, that, because of this, the experience was not grounded in reality; for it took place in the encounter of God and prophet, in what the prophets called "being taken into the Council of Yahweh which

19. (contd.)

determines history. (Jer. 23.18,22)

18. A. Guillaume discusses 'foretelling' and 'forth-telling' in "Prophecy and Divination", p.111.

"There is no prophet in the Old Testament who was not a foreteller of the future and though the saying rightly lays stress on the fact that the prophets for the most part spoke in the name of God as men declaring His will and purpose; there can be no doubt whatever that they were feared because it was believed that they knew what was coming, and even had the power to bring about the events which they prophesied. When a prophet ceases to prophesy in this sense he ceases to be a prophet and becomes a preacher". See also *ibid.* pp. 173 and 233.

20. Vide G.W.H. Lampe, "The Seal of the Spirit", p. 29 (middle paragraph).

21. Vide A. Guillaume, *op.cit.*, pp. 343/344.

22. a. Ez. 2.2; 3.12,14; 8.3; 11.1,5,24;43.5
b. Ez. 37.1,14
c. Ez. 39,29
d. Cf. Ps. 74.9
e. Jer. 23.21 ff.
f. Is. 11.2 (See also Luke 4.4,16 ff.
g. Is. 42.1

23. This essay would not be complete without reference to A. Johnson's "The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God", where he expounds a very interesting conception of the "Extension of Yahweh's personality". The prophet who was a member of his intimate Council became Yahweh 'in person'. This conception cannot be restricted to the prophet alone, for it includes such human agents of Yahweh as the King, the Priest, or any member of society who was "the Servant of God". p.37.

In this chapter the priest, as the instrument of the Spirit, has had but passing mention, and has not been worked out in detail as had been done for hero, king and prophet. This is mainly because there are no direct references to the priest, though references are explicit on the other agents of Yahweh. But there are implicit references, and they must be taken seriously. Prophet Malachi says about the priest: "For the lips of a priest should guard knowledge and men should seek instruction from his mouth for he is

Notes: History as the Stage

23. (Contd.)

MESSENGER OF THE LORD OF HOSTS." (2.7) W. Robinson in "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament" says, "Yet we cannot hope to understand the revelation of God in the Old Testament without putting the work of the priest alongside that of the prophet". p.222.

In II Chronicles 20.14 mention is made of the Spirit coming upon a Levite and he declares the will of God in a given situation. Compare II Chronicles, 27.20ff. though the commentators do not say he was a priest. See also the chapter on "Priest and Prophet" in W. Robinson's "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament" and A.R. Johnson, "The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel" which throws a new light on the meaning of cultus and priesthood. Jeremiah considers the misuse of the prophetic and priestly office equally criminal. Jer. 5. 30,31.

24. The Universalism of Joel brought about by the outpouring of the Spirit, (2.28,29) is only universalism within the Jewish community. Christians re-interpreted this in the light of their own experiences, as transcending the limits of Jewish religious and national life; they gave to this universalism a meaning which is not in Joel himself, though he was cited as its protagonist. Vide Acts II, 17-21 and also H.B. Swete, "The Holy Spirit in the New Testament", pp. 75,76

25. Vide E.F. Scott, "The Spirit in the New Testament", pp. 50 ff. Compare with this the idea of Wisdom who found no place to dwell amongst men and so took her place amongst the angels. Enoch 42.1 ff.

26. This hope found expression in the conception of "the Son of Man" as a semi-divine and semi-human being who would be able to express the divine-human syncretism better than other instruments who only expressed it partially. It is only through such an individual that the Spirit may be brought to rest in history. The conception of the 'Son of Man' was wrong in interpreting the Son of Man as one who was imposed on history from without and so was not the fulfilment of history from within. It violated human freedom. The Son of Man as depicted in Apocalyptic literature was not sufficiently human to be inside history and to receive into the divine spirit with which to manifest the purpose of God from within.

APPENDIX B.

THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLF BULTMANN WITHIN
THE SETTING OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.

(A short historical review)

The contemporary Continental theological scene shows signs of deep crisis which are caused chiefly by the theology of Rudolf Bultmann.

The Continent of Europe has been the scene in the past of polemical theology between the various denominations, Lutheran against Reformed, and both against Roman Catholic. At present, however, the denominational conflict, though by no means extinct especially between Protestants, (as exemplified by the writings of Professor Karl Barth), and Roman Catholics, is chiefly marked with odium theologicum between Continental Protestant theological schools. This is not a new situation for the conflict is rather old. This theological struggle can best be understood through the Christian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and adequate understanding of which has been markedly lacking in the theology of Europe. This does not mean that the quest for this doctrine has not been going on, but that it has often ended in a cul-de-sac, chiefly because of the failure to understand revelation in terms of Christology and Pneumatology, and to interpret Christology pneumatologically and Pneumatology Christologically.

Thus, for instance, Protestant Orthodoxy, (by which is meant the Biblicist, fundamentalist School of Theology of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th Centuries), by its doctrine of verbal inspiration inevitably narrowed the meaning of Revelation and interpreted it in terms of a rationally/

/rationally conceived doctrine , one which was sent from Above, and was contained in the Bible as the word of God and demanded obedience as did the Jewish Mosaic Law. Such a doctrine of Revelation depersonalised and mechanised both Christology and Pneumatology. Christ was the Law Giver, and the Holy Spirit the Executor of His Law.

This Biblical authoritarianism imperilled the freedom and spirituality of man who could not give expression to his inner life as a spontaneous response to God, since God did not meet him as the Being Who was offering him fellowship with Him in the Person of Christ, Who revealed the Divine Love of God and inspired a free response and love in man's heart by the Holy Spirit, - but only as the impersonal Logos in the form of a Book. Man sought escape in pietism and mysticism which, being man-conceived rather than God-revealed religion, was vitiated by human subjectivity, and dominated by the human psyche instead of the Divine Pneuma. Thus in Protestant Orthodoxy God and man faced each other as outsiders to each other. And the dreadful thing was that the Divine Revelation of God in Christ was so much rationalised that the Christ was not the life-giving Spirit-Person but the 'Sermo' - the Divine, cold and abstract 'Thou shalt'.

Such an interpretation of Christ precludes any possibility of understanding either Christology or Pneumatology, and also Anthropology by which the inner freedom of/

/of man is revealed through God Who meets him in Christ and claims him as a child, establishing the communion between them through the Holy Spirit, in Whom man recognises Christ as the Lord, and God as the Father. (1). Of course man was told that Christ is the Lord, and God the Father, on the authority of the Bible, but he was precluded from grasping this from within his personality. His freedom and spirituality were shackled by the rationalised version of him standing before God as One Whom he has to obey and listen to, as could not be otherwise when God does not meet man in His Word as a person but as a command or doctrine.

It was inevitable that reaction should set in. Schleismacher led the revolt. His dictum 'that religion is a feeling of dependence on God' aimed at bringing God inside human subjectivity, and breaking the chains of the cold rationalism of Protestant orthodoxy. Schleismacher also described religion as the birth of God-consciousness within man. (2). The pendulum has now swung from the rationalistic/

(1) By anthropology in this essay is meant the doctrine of man in the light of the New Testament Revelation.

(2) V. K. Barth: "The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life". P.36.

/rationalistic objectivism of Protestant Orthodoxy to the subjective understanding of the Christian revelation.

Schleismacher was followed by a host of notable theologians, to mention only Ritschle, Harnack, Hermann and Tricoeltsch.

In their anxiety to liberate the spirituality of man and his freedom from the oppressive theology of Protestant

Orthodoxy, the liberals attacked the Absolute-ness of the Christian religion and the once-for-allness of Christ,

which seemed to them to be responsible for the rigidity of

the orthodoxy. The claim was made for Christianity that it,

above all other religions, gave the fullest opportunity

for expression to the human spirit and so speeded progress

(Here one is very aware how much the liberals were children

of the age whose watchword was progress. In Christianity

the human spirit came into its own and acquired 'die Kraft',

the power to determine itself. Christian Revelation was

made into Religiosität containing timeless truths. (1)

Being/

-
- (1) How the Liberal Theologians secularised Christian Religion may be seen from the following passage of E. Tricoeltsch concerning the Holy Spirit: "Die modern Welt hat diesen Begriff des Heiligen Geistes von der Kirche abgelöst und auf den gesamten von der Christlichen Lebenswelt berührten Geistes Zusammenhang überhaupt übertragen". E.T. "Glaubenslehre" München und Leipzig, 1925. Tricoeltsche "Glaubenslehre" p.381. "In the religious moral process the creature's Spirit is released from the state of nature, and grows in him more and more out of nature's state into the life of reason, the life of the Divine Spirit". (quoted by K. Barth: "The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life" p.62.).

/Being children of European rationalism, they also conceptualised their views in the theological and philosophical forms and both arbitrarily and dogmatically expected universal acceptance of them.

When after the first world war, the whole world of romanticism and humanism with its idea of progress broke down, Liberal theology which was so closely bound up with it, reached a crisis also. The search for the Absolute character in Christianity was sought, and with it began the liberation of the human spirit in this crisis from the meaningless Religiosität of the Liberals. From this crisis was born the theology of Revelation of Karl Barth as the new re-statement of Christianity in terms of the Divine Absoluteness of God in Christ. (1).

Barthianism has been the major force in Protestant Theology both on the Continent and beyond it. In order to re-establish the Absolute Claim of God which meets us in/

-
- (1) Prof. Fritz Lieb of Basel University, friend and contemporary of Barth, described to me once the coming of the Dialectic Theology as a tremendous liberation. Because the Absoluteness of the Christian Revelation was asserted, this compelled one to take God and one's destiny seriously, and no hope was in the air.

/in Christ, Barth has been led to assert the Holiness and Otherness of God in such a way that his anthropology is found wanting. There are two reasons for this. First, the influence of Luther and Calvin, with their sola fide and sola gratia doctrines, and the Reformers' doctrine of total depravity and his revolt against the nineteenth Century humanist who glorified himself. (1). Second, though his conception of Revelation and Christ are more personalistic, nevertheless the scholastic and systematic form in which Barth's theology is presented, with its vindication of the Bible as the Word of God, speaking with authority, has subconsciously created fear in the world where the old Biblicist Orthodoxy is still remembered that here was another danger to human spirituality and freedom. Barthian theology creates an impression of doctrinal authoritarianism and this is chiefly because his Pneumatology is/

(1)

When one hears Barth lecturing one is aware that he is anxious to leave no loophole for a humanist of the 19th Century and he with great force destroys the self-righteous and self-contained world of the man of liberal theology. When Barth develops his anthropology one is aware that his concept of man is determined by his view of the 19th Century humanist and he generalises this concept. This vitiates Barthian anthropology.

/is dominated by his Christology. This is seen in the caveat which Barth makes whenever the word 'experience' is mentioned. (1). In my opinion in this subconsciously lies the opposition to Barthian theology in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann. Bultmann's theology does not attack Barth directly but attacks the Biblical and theological foundations of Barthian theology. Bultmann is anxious to bring the problem of the Kerygma into the sphere of anthropology. Man must participate in his own existence: this is the distum of his theology and he is anxious to establish it against the transcendentalist Barthian theology in which man's participation in his existence is lacking. This, which in Bultmann's theology is a chief concern, makes Bultmann's thought move chiefly on the level of theological immanence. Here it seems clear that the neo-orthodoxy of Barth is being challenged by the neo-liberalism of Bultmann, and though Bultmann is described as the opponent of the Liberals, he and his theology would be unintelligible without Liberal ancestry, as also would Barth's. (In the sense of protest against the Liberals).

In what follows is an attempt to understand this struggle of schools and systems of theology on the Continent against each other. The problems cannot be resolved so long as the Word/

(1) Vide Barth: "The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life" P.50.

VIII.

Word and the Spirit are interpreted by each other as one subordinate to the other which is not the case in spite of the fact that the Word and the Spirit comprehend each other and speak on each other's behalf. This must be understood dialectically, as the Revelation of Love, whereby any subordination is in fact an expression of transcendence. Thus, while the Word or the Spirit appear subordinate one to the other at the same time they are in fact expressing their unity in the Divine Transcendence of God the Father Who begets the Word as the utterance of His own Selfhood as an Act of Love, as the Revelation of Himself, and in this act of Revelation, bestows upon the Word the whole Godhead in Whom He is revealed. This act is the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. The Holy Spirit both comprehends the Word and manifests the Word, (not Himself), as the Divine Utterance. When the Word and the Holy Spirit appear subordinate the one to the other, they are in that moment being subordinate to God the Father because, through His Love, He has subordinated Himself to them by emptying His whole Being on their behalf. But they do not usurp, (Greek - arpaizo), this Love but in return they subordinate themselves to Him and empty themselves on His behalf. In revelation this appears as subordination either of the Son to the Spirit or of the Spirit to the Son, which it is, in fact also, but this subordination has nothing to do with categories/

/categories, greater or smaller, primarily or secondarily as these categories do not appertain to the realm of Love by which the Divine Life is made personal inside and creative outside itself. Thus the Divine Word, the Logos, manifests itself as the meaning, and the meaning manifests itself to man as the Divine and human rationality. But it is not rationality (ratio) in the sense of Doctrine as Protestant Orthodoxy interpreted the Word. This abstract de-humanised interpretation would not have happened if the Word, the Divine Meaning, had been seen as addressed not to man's rationality but to man's personality as the revelation of his destiny. In other words, it concerns the human spirit which recognises that the Word, in addressing it, bestows upon it the fellowship, and this fellowship reveals that the Word is Life, for from within it, the Spirit, in whom man's humanity and personality find expression and fulfilment, is revealed. This awareness that the Revelation of God is addressed not to his reason (ratio) but to his inner selfhood, has led the Liberals to assert God as the Spirit, (Pneuma), rather than the Word. And they subordinated the Word, the Meaning, to the Spirit, so depriving the Spirit of His Divine Logos, and the Spirit was bound to be interpreted not by the Divine Word, but by the human word, and that is why the Liberals turned the Divine Revelation into relativistic/

/relativistic Religiosität. Thus, both the Divine Word and the Divine Pneuma, vanished from Liberal theology, and in their place appeared a human version of the Divine Word, (humanism), and a human version of the Holy Spirit, (Romanticism). Incidentally, in Protestant Orthodoxy, the Spirit was subordinated to the Word, and appeared as Inspiration. Thus for them, the Word became Doctrine which is a human version of the Divine Word, and the Spirit the Good Conduct, (Pietism) a human version of the Holy Spirit.

Barth has greatly redeemed this situation, but in him also Pneumatology became subordinated to Christology. Barth seems to have been led into this by his anxiety to safeguard the Transcendence of the Word; he feared if he had not subordinated the Spirit to the Word he could not have safeguarded the Transcendence of the Word, as the Holy Spirit is the Revelation of God not, like the Word, sank von oben, but from within human spirituality and in Him the Revelation of God is Divine Immanence. Instead of interpreting the Divine Transcendence of the Word through the Divine Immanence of the Spirit as the simultaneous Revelation of God in the Word and in the Spirit, (though Barth acknowledges the Holy Spirit as the Divine Immanence), to safeguard Divine Transcendence of the Word, he subordinates the Spirit to the Word, and this in spite of the Trinitarian Doctrine of God he/

he professes in the Prolegomena of his Dogmatics. (1).

The consequence of this theology has been disastrous for his anthropology. God reveals Himself to the Barthian man from above to confront him and to reveal to him His own complete Otherness, before which he is summoned to repent and receive forgiveness obediently as an act from above, rather than actively from within his existence as an act of Love and his response to Divine Love. This free response to God in Love makes man to participate in God through his self-sacrifice and renunciation to God who renounces Himself in love for man. Instead of seeing in this not man's own action, and man's own 'good work', but the Holy Spirit expressing our own life of sonship, in whom man says, "I live, and yet, not I, but Christ in me", Barth is afraid that man will not give to God His own due and will only say, "I live, I do, I am", and thus usurp God's Own Grace, without adding, "I do not live, but Christ lives in me; I do not do, but Christ does the work within me; I am not but He, the Christ, is". Barth's man does not participate/

(1) In my opinion this is the reason why Barth stresses the Doctrine of Filioque. For him the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son safeguards the Transcendence of the Word. (but at what a cost!)

participate in his own existence by revealing God through his own spirituality and renouncing himself to God in his own freedom. Barth demands from man that in the act of being confronted with God's Word, he should accept God before he can love Him and should renounce himself to Him not in freedom but in slavish obedience. His gratitude to God springs from psychological fear rather than spiritual freedom. Here it must be pointed out against Barth that while indeed God gives everything, such a demand as Barth asks of man should not be asked of him. When man is awakened to God's Love through the Holy Spirit, he will renounce himself in freedom and cry "Abba, Father", and he will also participate freely in God because God will be there participating in His existence. Man may, of course, use God's own gifts for his own aggrandisement, and thereby demonise Divine Love - but that is the risk which God takes upon Himself, for he asks for a free response from His Children rather than demanding the obedience of slaves.

Bultmann subordinates both Christology and Pneumatology to anthropology to secure man's freedom and participation in his own existence and God. He spiritualises the Word and rationalises the Spirit to such a degree that they do not comprehend man and bring him to God, but rather man comprehends/

/comprehends them and brings himself to God. (1). Bultmann's theology revealed that anthropology is necessary to Christology and Pneumatology. Revelation is the creation of man as the new Being who in freedom participates both in his own existence/

-
- (1) I have been often reminded that this is a rather strong judgement. After a great deal of thought I find it difficult to change it. I am aware that Bultmann's theology exalts greatly the concept of grace, but unless grace is understood as the Revelation of the Holy Spirit in human existence and thus Holy Spirit centred, the grace ceases to be God's way of revealing man in God and God in man, but rather grace becomes a means of man's assertion of himself, before God after God had bestowed grace upon him. Absence of the personalistic doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Bultmann's theology compels me to assert that 'the strong judgement' is not an exaggeration but a caveat. My judgement is inferred from the way in which Bultmann states his most important view, namely that of the meaning of Christ for human existence. One could sketch this view schematically thus - the human self stands involved in the problem of existence which stands over against him. In Kerygma man's possibilities through Christ are revealed. Christ through Kerygma calls man to decide. In making the decision man acquires a 'Begriff' (a sort of gnosis) by which man is enabled to meet the problem of existence and overcome it. (But notice that here all happens within human subjectivity).

/existence and in God. But, where Christology is not interpreted through Pneumatology, and Pneumatology through Christology, as the truth of the same Divine Reality without subordination, the anthropology - the understanding of man as the New Being is impossible, for the whole spirituality of man is only possible in the Holy Spirit, for He is freedom and spirituality, (the very essence of Divine Life). Through Christ, He is the Father's gift to us and through Him the Father gives the gift of His Son, the Christ, the meaning of our existence, Who, since He is that, is also our Lord. In the Holy Spirit, the Father glorifies the Son, and the Son glorifies the Father and that glory is manifested in them who are Christ's, because He, the Holy Spirit, reveals Christ to them and the Christ reveals to them the Holy Spirit, and thus man is revealed to himself, participating in God and God participating in his existence. Thus man's being is related to God and himself. Bultmann's insistence on man's participation in his own existence, to a student of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit implies a quest for this doctrine and as such Bultmann's theology, in spite of its negative Pneumatology, is a step forward in man's existential understanding of Christian Revelation.

CONCLUSION

IN LAUDEM SPIRITUS SANCTI

O Holy Ghost, O faithful Paraclete,
Love of the Father and the Son,
In Whom Begetter and Begotten meet,
The goodness and the charity
The essence and integrity
Of each and both,
Their kindness and their gentleness
And joyousness:
Bond that holdeth God to man
Power that weds in one
Humanity and Deity.
God guiding all that is made
Throughout our day;
Gift that abides through an eternity
Of giving and is made no less.
Thy going forth preceded Time,
Thy pouring forth took place in Time,
The one, the well-spring of power
 and the river of Grace,
The other, the flowing, the giving,
 the light on our face.
Thou comest forth from Thy transcendent day,
To make for us this shining, festive day,
Thou who alone art worthily adored
With Father and with Son
Proceeding from the twain.
To Thee in heart and word
Be honour, glory, grace,
From men in every place
World without end.
 Amen.

(Attributed to Hildebart of Le Mans, 1133 - translation
by Helen Waddell in "The Times" of June 4th, 1949.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The text of the Bible used in this thesis is the Revised Standard Version (American). (Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.). Where other texts were used this is indicated in the text.
2. Abelson, J. Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature, London, 1912.
3. Allen, W.C. C.E.C. on the Gospel according to S. Matthew, Edinburgh, 1912.
4. Aquinas, Thomas. The Summa Theologica, Part I. No.2. London, 1912.
5. Arsenew, Nikolas. Mysticism and the Eastern Church. London, 1926.
6. " " Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism. (in Russian). YM.C.A. Press, Paris 1930.
7. " " The Orthodox Church and the Western Christendom. (in Russian), Warsaw, 1929.
8. Baillie, D.M. God was in Christ. London, 1948.
9. Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London, 1947.
10. Barth, Karl. The Doctrine of the Word of God. Edinburgh, 1936.
11. " " The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life. London, 1938.
12. Berdyaev, Nikolas. Slavery and Freedom. London, 1943.
13. " " Freedom and Spirit, London, 1935.
14. Bolshakov, Serge. The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in Khomyakov and Moehlen. London, 1946.
15. Brunner, Emil. The Misunderstanding of the Church. London, 1952.
16. " " Dogmatics, Vol.I. London, 1942.

II.

17. Buchsel, Friedrich. Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament. Gutersloh, 1926.
18. Buckley, T.A. A History of the Council of Trent. London, 1852.
19. " " The Catechism of the Council of Trent. (Eng. Translation), London, 1852.
20. Bulgakov, Sérgius. Le Paraclet. (in French), Paris, 1944.
21. " " Utyeshitely. (in Russian), Paris, 1936.
22. " " The Orthodox Church. London, 1935.
23. Bultmann, R. Jesus. (in German), Berlin, 1926.
24. " " The Theology of the New Testament. Vol.I. London, 1952.
25. Calvin, John. Institutes. Vol.I. Edinburch, 1863.
26. " " Les Pensees sur Le Saint-Esprit. Geneve, 1936.
27. The Catholic Encyclopoedia, Vol.III. New York, 1908.
28. Cheyne, T.K. The Mines of Isaiah Re-explored. London, 1912.
29. The Church of God. Anglo-Russian Symposium. London, 1934.
30. Clark, William. The Paraclete. Edinburch, 1909.
31. Cook, Stanley, A. The Old Testament: a reinterpretation. London, 1936.
32. Cullmann, Oscar. Early Christian Worship. London, 1953.
33. " " Tradition. Zurich, 1954.
34. Curtis, Arthur H. The Vision and Mission of Jesus. Edinburch, 1954.

III.

35. Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edinburgh, 1904.
36. The Didache. (translated by J.A. Kleist S.J.) Longmans, 1948.
37. Douglas, (Principal). Isaiah One and his Book One. London, 1895.
38. Dunlop. Confessions of Faith. Vol.I. Edinburgh, 1719.
39. " " " Vol.II. Edinburgh, 1722.
40. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol.VI. Edinburgh, 1913.
41. Encyclopaedia Biblica. Vol. I. London, 1899.
42. The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch. (translated by J.A. Kleist S.J.). Longmans, 1946.
43. Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. Vol.I. (in English translation by C.F. Cruse), London, 1851.
44. Fison, J.E. The Blessing of the Holy Spirit. Longmans, 1950.
45. Florensky, Paul. Radost na Myeki. Sergiev Posad, 1907.
46. " " Vstupitel'noe Slovo. Sergiev Posad, 1914.
47. " " Stolp i Utverzdenie Istini. Moskva, 1914.
48. Fortescue, Adrian. The Orthodox Eastern Church, London, 1916.
49. Franks, Robert S. The Doctrine of the Trinity. London, 1953.
50. Franks, S.L. God With Us. London, 1946.
51. Dostoyevsky, F. Brothers Karamazov, Vol.I. (in addition of Every Man's Library), 1927.
52. Galtier, Paul S.J. Le Saint Esprit en Nouz d'apres Les Peres Grecs. Rome, 1946.
53. George, A. Raymond. Communion with God. London, 1953.

IV.

54. Gillet, Lev. Communion in Messiah. London, 1942.
55. Gogarten, Friedrich. Demythologising and History. London, 1955.
56. Gohler, Alfred. Calvins Lehre von der Heiligung. Munchen, 1934.
57. Guillaume, Alfred. Prophecy and Divination. London, 1938.
58. Hammond, W.A. Definitions of Faith. (Oxford, 1843.)
59. Henson, H.H. Church Problems. (Symposium). London, 1900.
60. Keppe, Heinrich. Reformed Dogmatics. London, 1950.
61. Hodgson, Leonard. The Doctrine of the Trinity. London, 1943.
62. Hort, F.J.A. The Christian Ecclesia. London, 1908.
63. Humphries, A.L. The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience. London, 1917.
64. Ilyin, V.N. Prepodobniy Serafim Sarovsky. Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1925.
65. Inokentie, (Archimandrite). Bogoslovie Oblichitel'noe Vol.II. (in Russian). Kazan, 1859.
66. Ivanov, V. Freedom and the Tragic Life. London, 1952
67. Jaspers, Karl. Die Plage der Entmythologisierung. Munchen, 1954.
68. Jessop, T.E. Law and Love. London, 1948.
69. Justinus, (Justin Martyr). Apologien I Teil (Text). Munster i.W.1912.
70. The Jewish Encyclopaedia. Vol.VI. New York and London,1904.
71. Johnson, A.R. The Vitality of Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff, 1949.
72. " " The One and Many in the Israelite Conception of God. Cardiff, 1942.

73. Kern, Kiprian (Archimandrite). Eucharistia.
(in Russian). Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1947.
74. Keven, E.P. The Saving Work of the Holy Spirit.
London, 1953.
75. Khomiakov, Alexei S. The Church is One. London, 1948
76. Kissane, E.J. The Book of Isaiah. Vol. II. Dublin, 1943.
77. Knight, George A.F. From Moses to Paul. London, 1946.
78. Lampe, G.W.H. The Seal of the Spirit. Longmans, 1951
79. Lampert, E. The Divine Realm. London, 1943.
80. Lawson, John. The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus.
London, 1948.
81. Lee, William. The Inspiration of Holy Scripture.
Dublin, 1864.
82. Leisegang, Hans. Pneuma Hagion. Leipzig, 1922.
83. Lamont, Daniel. The Church of the Creeds. London, 1923.
84. Lossky, Vladimir. Theologie Mystique de L'Eglise
d'Orient. (Aubier) Paris, 1944.
85. McFadyen, J.E. I +II Corinthians. London, 1911.
86. Mitropolit, Anthonie. Utchenie Tzerkvi o Svyatom
Duchye. Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1925.
87. Nuttal, G.F. The Holy Spirit and Curselves. Oxford, 1947.
88. " " The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and
Experience. Oxford, 1946.
89. Origenes. Werke V. Leipzig, 1913.
90. O'Shaughnessy, Thomas S.J. Development of the Meaning
of the Spirit in the Keren. Roma, 1953.
91. Osliches. Christentum Documente. Vols. I-II.
(ed. Hans Ehrenburg) Munchen, 1925.
92. Palitzkiy, V.A. Na Zeprosi Duha. Petrograd, 1914.

VI.

93. Pieper, Francis. The Christian Dogmatics. Vols. I-II. St. Louis, Missouri, 1946.
94. Pieper, Otto. God and History. New York, 1939.
95. Pontifex, Dom Mark. Belief in Trinity. Longmans, 1954.
96. Preiss, Theo. Das Innere Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes. Zurich, 1947.
97. Popov, Andrey. Old Russian polemical works against the Latins from 11th to 15th century. Moscow, 1875.
98. Prestige, G.L. God in Patristic Thought. London, 1952.
99. Procopowicz, Theophanis. Tractatus De Processione Spiritus Sancti. Gothae A.D. MDCCCLXXII.
100. Ragen, C.E. The Creator Spirit. London, 1927.
101. Rees, Thomas. The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience. London, 1915.
102. De Regnon, S.J. Etudes de Theologie Positive sur la Saint Trinite. Serie 3.II. Paris, 1898.
103. Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh, 1911.
104. " " Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford, 1946.
105. " " The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. London, 1913.
106. Robinson, T.H. The Gospel of Matthew. London, 1923.
107. Robson, James. Christ in Islam. London, 1929.
108. Ruch, Theodor. Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist. Zurich, 1952.
109. St. Augustine. De Trinitate. (Edition of Benedictine Fathers). Paris, 1837.
110. St. Athanasius. The Incarnation of the Word of God. London, 1944.
111. St. Irenaeus. Contra Omnes Haereses. Lipsiae, 1853.

VII.

112. Sayers, Dorothy L. The Mind of the Maker. London, 1941.
113. Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. Das Hagion Pneuma als Person und als Charisma. (Rhein Verlag) Zurich, 1946.
114. " " " " The Church. (Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's T.W.2. N.T.). London, 1950.
115. Schweizer, Eduard. Geist und Gemeinde in Neuen Testament und Heute. Munchen, 1952.
116. Scott, Ernest F. The Fourth Gospel: its purpose and theology. Edinburgh, 1906.
117. " " " " The Spirit in the New Testament. London, 1923.
118. Shapland, C.R.B. Letters of St. Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit. London, 1951.
119. Simpson, P. Carnegie. Life of Principal Rainy, Vol.I. London, 1909.
120. Snaith, H. Norman. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London, 1944.
121. Swete, H.B. The Holy spirit in the New Testament. London, 1909.
122. " " " " The History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy spirit. Cambridge, 1878.
123. " " " " The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. London, 1912.
124. Ternovsky, Peter. Bogoslovie Dogmaticheskoe. Moscow, 1839.
125. The Teaching of the Catholic Church (Symposium) Vols. I-II. London, 1947.
126. Temple, William. Christian Faith and Life. London, 1931.
127. Tertullian. Adversus Plaxean. (Works of Tertullian in Latin Tomus II), Lipsiae, 1857.
128. Thornton, L. The Incarnate Lord. London, 1928.
129. Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology. Chicago, 1950.

VIII.

130. Tillich, Paul. The Courage To Be. London, 1952.
131. Watkin, Jones, H. The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church. London, 1922.
132. Weber, Otto. Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics. London, 1953.
133. Welch, Claude. The Trinity in Contemporary Theology. London, 1953.
134. Wood, Irving. The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature. London, 1904.
135. Wordsworth, Chr. Letters to Mr. Gondon. London, 1948.
136. Zander, L.A. Vision and Action. London, 1952.
137. Zedda, P. Silverio, S.J. L'adozione a figli di Dio e lo Santo Spirito. Roma, 1952.
138. Zernikav, Adam. The Eastern Orthodox Theological Exposition of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. (in Russian). Vol.I. Pochaev, 1902. Vol.II. Zitomir, 1906. (ed. by Davidovich).
-
139. Pietro Scave Polano. Historia del Concilio Tridentino. 2nd edition, 1629.
140. Niesel, Wilhelm. Die Theologie Calvins. Munchen, 1937.
-
141. Lloyd, Philip. The Holy Spirit in the Acts. London, 1952.
142. Solovyev, Vladimir. The Meaning of Love. London, 1946.
143. Karl Ludwig Smidt "The Church" (Bible Key Words) London 1950.
144. Troeltsch E. Glaubenslehre. Munchen and Leipzig 1925.

JOURNALS

1. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Vol.37. No.1.,1954.
2. The Christian East. Vol.II. Nos3, 5 and 6. 1953.
3. The Eastern Church Quarterly (E.C.Q.) Vol.X. Nos. 1,2,3 and4, 1954.
4. The Eastern Church Quarterly; Supplementary issue, Vol.VII. 1948.
5. The Presbyterian world. Vol. XXII. Nos 7 and 8. Geneva,1954.
6. The Scottish Journal of Theology Vol.VII. No. 4. 1954.
7. The Scottish Journal of Theology. March issue, 1953.
8. " " " " " . June issue, 1953.
9. Sobornost, September, 1939.
10. " No. 20, December, 1939.
11. Verbum Caro. Vol.IV. Nos. 13-16. 1950, (in French).